DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 487 EF 005 702

AUTHOR Kirby, Robert G., Jr.
TITLE Policy Study of Non-School Group Usage of Missouri Public School Facilities.
PUB DATE 1993-10-00
NOTE 179p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Policy; Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; *Guidelines; *Public Schools; *Shared Facilities
IDENTIFIERS *Missouri; *Policy Reviews

ABSTRACT

This study presents survey data from school district administrators on the rules and regulations that govern non-school use of public school facilities as adopted by 165 Missouri Public School Districts. It compares whether districts having written policies governing non-school use of facilities differed from districts with no such policies relative to enrollment, state classification status, membership in the Missouri School Boards Association, and classification as being metropolitan or outstate districts. Data show 98 percent of the school districts surveyed allowed non-school use and 93.1 percent had written policies regarding such use. District size and location had no apparent influence on the existence of written policies. Finally, 86.2 percent of the districts charged fees for non-school use of facilities. Large districts generally charged more and had more specific rental policies for non-school use of facilities than did smaller districts. Appendices provide the survey instrument, various correspondence regarding the study, policy statements, sample fee structures, and population of the study. (Contains 72 references.) (GR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 487

POLICY STUDY OF NON-SCHOOL GROUP USAGE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

ROBERT G. KIRBY JR.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. Robert Shaw Dissertation Supervisor

EF 005 702

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert G. Kirby
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST 2

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate Faculty, have examined a dissertation entitled:

POLICY STUDY OF NON-SCHOOL USAGE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES

presented by ROBERT G. KIRBY, JR.

a candidate for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Robert C. Shaw, Educational Administration
Major Advisor

Dr. Donald F. DeMoulin, Educational Administration

Dr. Roger D. Harting, Educational Administration

Dr. Richard V. Hatley, Educational Administration

Dr. Richard Linhardt, Practical Arts and Vocational-Technical Education

October 1993

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Gratitude is expressed to my advisor, Dr. Robert Shaw and members of my committee, Dr. Roger Harting, Dr. Don DeMoulin, Dr. Richard Linhardt, and Dr. Richard Hatley for their patience, guidance, and assistance to the writer as he persisted to graduation.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the many school administrators who willingly participated in this study and made it possible.

The writer has a tremendous respect and appreciation for his secretary, Gaila Hunter, student secretary, Latonya Stanley, and district public information officer, Shirley Wurth, for their editing, typing, and cheerfulness demonstrated during this project. Appreciation is expressed to my Superintendent, Dr. Grenvell Foraker, and Assistant Superintendent, Dr. Michael Watkins, for their commitment allowing me to finish this degree.

The deepest gratitude goes to my wife, Marilyn, and my two daughters, Shelly and Shannon, for their patience, hope, and love during many years of classes, research, writing, and "school" business.

POLICY STUDY OF NON-SCHOOL USAGE

OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Robert G. Kirby

Dr. Robert Shaw Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

Purpose of Study: This study focused upon the rules and regulations that govern non-school use of public school facilities as adopted by boards of education in 165 Missouri Public School Districts.

Procedure: Data were obtained from a questionnaire developed by the writer and policies returned school administrators of the school districts in the study.

A chi-square test was utilized to determine if the school districts having written policies in effect regarding use of school facilities by non-school groups were different from those with no such policies relative to district enrollment, state classification status (AAA, AA, unclassified, accredited, provisional accreditation, unaccredited), membership in the Missouri School Boards Association, and classification as being metropolitan or outstate districts.

Results: It would appear from the data provided that Missouri K-12 Public School Districts have taken full advantage of Missouri Statutes allowing non-school use of facilities. The vast majority, 98 percent, of the districts included in the study allowed non-school use of facilities as long as the use did not interfere with the educational purpose to which the facilities are devoted.

The majority of the school districts, 93.1 percent, in the study have written policies addressing non-school use of facilities. The size and geographic location of the districts did not appear to be relevant to the existence or non-existence of a written policy concerning facility usage by non-school groups.

The majority of the school districts, 86.2 percent, charge fees for non-school use of facilities. There were significant relationships between the size of the school district, membership in Missouri School Boards Association, classification of the school district, and whether or not it charged fees for non-school use. Large districts generally charge more and have more specific rental policies for non-school use of facilities than do smaller districts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....ii

ABSTRACT.....iii

LIST OF TABLES.....ix

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study.....1

Statement of the Problem.....7

Purpose of the Study.....8

Hypotheses.....12

Definitions of Terms.....13

Limitation of the Study.....14

Summary of Chapter.....14

Organization of the Study.....15

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview.....16

Missouri Statutes.....19

General Policy Statement.....24

Policy Issue of Building Usage.....27

Legal Issue of Facility Usage.....30

Renting to Non-School Groups.....37

Extended Usage of School Facilities Concerns.....41

Community Education Uses of School Facilities.....43

Expansion of School Roles and Facility Uses.....45

Summary of Chapter.....46

III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Introduction.....49

Population and Sample.....49

Development of the Instrument.....51

Collection of the Data.....52

Processing the Data.....52

Summary of Chapter.....54

Research Design/Variable Matrix.....56

IV. FINDING OF THE STUDY

Introduction.....57

Results.....57

Results of Null Hypotheses.....58

Research Question Ho1 1.1.....59

Research Question Ho1 2.2.....59

Research Question Ho1 3.3.....62

Research Question Ho1 4.4.....63

Research Question Ho2 1.1.....64

Research Question Ho2 2.2.....65

Research Question Ho2 3.3.....67
Research Question Ho2 4.4.....69
Research Question Seven.....70
Research Question Eight.....72
Research Question Nine.....72
Research Question Ten.....78
Research Question Eleven.....79
Research Question Twelve.....80
Research Question Thirteen.....80
Research Question Fourteen.....80
Research Question Fifteen.....81
Research Question Sixteen.....81
Research Question Seventeen.....84
Research Question Eighteen.....84
Research Question Nineteen.....85
Research Question Twenty.....85
Discussion.....88
Chapter Summary.....89

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS. AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary.....91
Findings.....98
Conclusions.....106
Discussion.....108

REFERENCES.....110
Appendix A: Survey Instrument.....117
Appendix B: Communications.....123
Appendix C: Policy Statements.....125
Appendix D: Sample Fee Structures.....151
Appendix E: Population of Study.....163
VITA.....167

LIST OF TABLES

Table page

1. Research Design/Variable Matrix.....56

2. Frequency and percentage of district response to enrollment, classification, MSBA membership and geographical location.....60

3. Incidence of written policies on the basis of school district classification.....61

4. Incidence of written policies on the basis of MSBA membership.....64

5. Incidence of fees charged for non-school use on the basis of school size (enrollment).....66

6. Incidence of fees charged for non-school use on the basis of school district classification.....67

7. Incidence of fees charged for non-school use on the basis of school district membership in MSBA.....68

8. Incidence of fees charged for non-school use on the basis of metropolitan or outstate location.....69

9. Frequency and percentage of school district responses to Question seven through twenty.....73

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

> The opening of a new school house is an occasion which will deserve a public and joyful commemoration. Out of it are to be the issues of life to the community in the midst of which it stands, and like the river seen in the vision of the prophet, which nourishes all along its banks trees whose leaves were for the healing of the nations. The well-spring of all its influences should be a spot consecrated by religion. In prayer, and in praise to the giver of all good, and the creator of all being, in song, and hymn and anthem, and in addresses from those whose position in society will command the highest respect for any object in whose behalf they may speak, and in the presence of all classes of the community, of pupils, and teachers, of fathers and mothers, of the old and young. The school house should be set apart to the sacred purpose of the physical, intellectual, and moral culture of the children who will be gathered within its walls (Barnard, 1850, p. 402).

School buildings are considered the legal property of the state, not of the local district. This statement is true even though buildings may have been paid for solely from funds raised on the local district level. The point bears emphasis here, for the concept of the legal nature of school buildings is sometimes difficult for citizens in local school districts to comprehend. They may be inclined to look upon the buildings as "their" buildings, because they were financed with "their" money. Thus, despite the fact

that buildings are constructed for school purposes, various groups often seek the use of school buildings for other than school purposes. Whether and to what extent school buildings may legally be used for non-school purposes has been widely litigated.

Determination of school building use rests completely with the legislature except for possible constitutional restrictions. Statutes pertaining to the use of school buildings differ from state to state, both in terms of number and specificity. Typically, restrictive legislation is lacking, and the management and control of school buildings is left almost exclusively to the discretion of local boards of education. In some states statutes expressly empower local boards to allow buildings to be used for certain purposes at the discretion of the board (Ruetter, 1985, p. 292).

There have been two basic general legal objections raised when local boards have permitted the use of school buildings for non-school purposes. One goes to the fundamental concept that boards of education are agencies of limited powers and their authority does not extend to areas in which the legislature has not

permitted them to operate. The second is that a non-school use constitutes an expenditure of public money for a private purpose. Other objections arise over use by special groups or for special purposes. Owners of business establishments frequently object to the use of school property for activities in possible competition with their businesses (Ruetter, 1985, p. 292).

When examining its authority to govern schools, the board of education should carefully formulate and adopt policy statements. This difficult process cannot be successfully accomplished without guidance from the professional staff and, at times, an attorney. Many techniques can be used to formulate a policy. After policy formulation, it becomes the responsibility of the superintendent of schools to establish provisions that implement board policies (ReBore, 1984).

Policy making is judged to be a most important function of a board of education (Knezevich, 1975). The development of a well-defined policy is no simple chore. It requires discipline, considerable debate, discussion, and time. On occasion the value of policy formulation may be questioned in view of the time and effort required. Most authorities agree that written

statements of policy are essential to effective school administration.

In general, carefully written school board policies should address the procedures and other concepts of budgeting, accounting, auditing, and management of school property (Knezevich, 1975). Policy statements should encompass all aspects of school operations that command the attention of the school board. Policies are valuable, according to Knezevich (1975, p. 322), because:

1. They help clarify responsibilities among the board, administrative staff, teaching staff, and community.
2. They help promote more consistent and prudent decision making.
3. They provide continuity of action.
4. They can save the board time, money, and effort, for many specified questions deal with similar principles, that is, repeat themselves in a variety of forms and therefore can be handled in a manner suggested by a single policy.
5. They help improve community relations.

6. They help reduce pressure on the board from special-interest pleaders.
7. They help reduce criticism of board action when it becomes apparent to the community that board decisions are based on well-defined and consistent policies rather than on expediency.
8. They give the board a sense of direction.
9. They formulate orderly review of board practices.
10. They insure a better-informed board and staff.

According to Carver (1991, p. 42), up-to-date policies are the only ones that work. A board can ensure that policies are kept current more by compulsively operating from its policy manual than by vowing to do annual reviews. When a board lives by its policies, the policies will either work or be changed. The policies will not then collect dust. Policies must never end with whims, but a bang; they must not be allowed to fade away into oblivion. Staff can help by acting as if the board is serious about every policy not yet rescinded.

Boards of education, acting in their capacity as policy making bodies for their respective public school

districts, are often called upon to make decisions relating to non-educational as well as educational functions of their school systems. This study focuses on the rules and regulations adopted by boards of education in Missouri public school districts that govern non-school use of public school buildings.

Debates regarding how public school facilities can be efficiently used are becoming more common. It seems a waste to have school buildings, playgrounds, and equipment standing idle after school hours, on weekends, and during vacation periods. Community citizens find themselves locked out of facilities paid for by tax dollars. In many communities, public school facilities are conveniently located by design near residential areas. School facilities are generally the largest structures suitable for a variety of community activities in residential areas. These facilities are well-equipped to handle a variety of group sizes. It seems unreasonable to expect that millions of dollars worth of public buildings can continue to be under-utilized in view of expensive construction costs and operating costs (Deselms, 1978). It would appear to be desirable for the school district boards of education

to devise plans and practices to optimize the utilization of school district facilities for the students and community alike.

Statement of the Problem

The development of written policy statements is a relatively new, mid-20th century phenomenon. References to written policies in the professional literature were practically non-existent prior to World War II (Knezevich, 1975). In contrast, since the end of World War II, it is difficult to find a study or publication dealing with school board activity that fails to emphasize the need for written policies. Boards have been slow in translating into practice the many exhortations to have written statements of policy to govern school operation.

There is a considerable body of opinion that supports the notion that one measure of a board's effectiveness is the existence of relevant policies to govern educational affairs. Working with and living by such policies is another measure of effectiveness. The existence of a written set of policies is documentation of the fact that the board is serious in the discharge

of its policy-making role to govern school operations (Knezevich, 1975, p. 322).

Policies concerning the usage of facilities by non-school groups have not undergone rigorous formulation. Most studies have addressed only the use of specific types of facilities. Little has been done to determine what facility usage policies are in effect in Missouri public schools. Little is known concerning the cost and benefits rendered with extended school facility usage beyond the traditional K-12 school day program.

It is apparent that research has not played a prominent role in the development of school district policies regulating the use of school facilities by non-school groups. Knowledge by the school board of non-school group needs within the community for use of school facilities could serve as a point of reference for school facility usage policies for non-school groups.

Purpose of the Study

There were three main purposes of this study. They were:

1. To determine the percentages of Missouri Public school districts that allow extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.
2. To determine which school districts have written board policies in regard to extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.
3. To determine typical and average fees charged by school districts which allowed extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.

Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Do Missouri public schools allow extended use of public school facilities by non-school groups?
2. Do Missouri public schools have board policies that govern extended use of school facilities by non-school groups?
3. Do Missouri public schools allowing extended use of school facilities charge for such usage and, if so, what are typical rates? Do the school districts have different rates for different types of groups?

4. How often are non-school facility usage policies and rate schedules reviewed by the school district?
5. Who is the school district representative most often responsible for administrating school district policies relating to facility usage by non-school groups?
6. Do the public schools allowing extended usage of facilities execute formal contracts for such usage?
7. Does the size of the school district relate to whether or not it has a written policy?
8. Do the public school districts policies provide reimbursement for supervision, utilities, capital outlay, security, and custodial service for extended use of facilities by non-school groups?
9. Do the public school districts restrict usage of facilities by non-school groups to residents of the school district?
10. Are there facilities in the school districts that are generally not available to non-school groups?

11. Is there a minimum age for the responsible person making the application to utilize school district facilities by non-school groups?
12. Do the school districts require insurance protection naming the school district as additional insured by the parties requesting use of school facilities?
13. Do the school districts restrict the times the school facilities can be used by non-school groups?
14. Do the school districts limit commercial ventures within the school facilities by non-school groups?
15. Do the school districts require that a group requesting extended use of school facilities be organized?
16. Do the school districts have a reciprocal agreement with other public or non-profit entities for extended facility usage?
17. Do the school districts clarify conduct and responsibilities by non-school user groups?

Hypotheses

Two major hypotheses, related to the research questions, were generated by the statement of the problem. The scope of this investigation renders the following null hypotheses:

Ho1 There are no significant differences between school districts with written policies on non-school group usage of school facilities and those without such policies, based on the following school district variables:

1.1 School size (student enrollment)

1.2 School classification (AAA, AA, U, Accredited, Provisional Accredited, Unaccredited)

1.3 Missouri School Boards Association membership (yes or no)

1.4 Population status (metropolitan or outstate)

Ho2 There are no significant differences between school districts which charge for non-school usage of school facilities and those which do not charge, based on the following school district variables:

1.1 School size (student enrollment)

1.2 School classification (AAA, AA, U, Accredited, Provisional Accredited, Unaccredited)

1.3 Missouri School Boards Association membership (yes or no)

1.4 Population status (metropolitan or outstate)

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined to assist the reader in interpretation of this study:

Non-School Group: Any group which has no direct affiliation with the ongoing educational program sponsored by the public school board.

Policy: Policy is defined as "a principle adopted by the board of education to chart a course of action for its administrators and to define the limits within which they will exercise judgement and discretion" (Tuttle, 1960, 37). Policy may be defined as values and perspectives that govern an organization. These values and perspectives form the bedrock on which the more mechanical and visible aspects of organization are based (Carver, 1991, 25-26). Public policy is defined by group theorists as the end result of the interaction

of the various interested pressure groups upon one another (Thompson, 1976, 7).

School Facility: Any building, land, or related property which comes under the jurisdiction of the school board (RSMO 177.031, 1992).

Limitation of the Study

Any generalizations drawn from the data may only be applied to the sample in the study. The specific time of this study was in 1992-1993 school year. This study was based on a random sample of Missouri K-12 public school districts. The sample used in Jones (1988) and Wells (1979) policy studies was utilized in this study.

Summary

Debates about how school facilities can be utilized more effectively and efficiently during and after school hours are becoming more common. School facilities represent a very large investment by the community and it is becoming less wise to let these well-equipped, strategically located, tax supported structures sit idle. It would appear desirable for boards of education to devise policies and practices to

optimize the utilization of school facilities for the students and community alike.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II will present material gleaned from a review of available literature concerning non-school use of school facilities. Chapter III describes the methods and procedures used to conduct this study. The development of the instrument to be used and the method to present the data are discussed as well. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV, based on data collected from the survey instrument completed by school superintendents. The summary, conclusions, and recommendation of this study appear in Chapter V.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

A school day of six to eight hours and a school year of nine months, usually from September to June, became standard practice when American society was primarily rural and agrarian. A slight modification was made in parts of the United States where certain agricultural crops matured in August or September. Schools were opened in July and continued in session until harvest time in those locations. The schools were closed for a period of four to six weeks and then re-opened and continued until a full term had been provided. The school day length and number of months that schools were in session were influenced by the agrarian economy that caused families to utilize children in farm labor (Finchum, 1967).

Today America's society is largely urban-industrial. Agriculture has been largely mechanized and manpower requirements are not as great as they once were. These developments have virtually eliminated the need and reason for long vacations from school. Practices of the past still remain with the school day

of six to eight hours, long vacations, and school terms of nine months (Finchum, 1967).

Some of the country's educational leaders and many of its taxpayers are advocating changes in the school schedule that will accommodate the changing pattern of American life. These advocates point out that nothing is sacred about the 180-day school year. Modification of the school schedule can insure efficient utilization of school facilities for educational purposes and can improve educational opportunities for more children. More efficient use of facilities also frees up resources for other school needs (Finchum, 1967).

In addition, there have been persistent demands in some quarters for more extensive use of schools by non-school groups. In many communities where churches historically were the only other facilities available for community gatherings, schools were considered as more appropriate places for programs and meetings of interest in segments of a heterogeneous society. In a changing social economic structure, new skills and broader educational backgrounds were prerequisites to productivity and job security.

The public facilities in California can be utilized by non-school and adult groups for specified purposes, subject to certain limitations and requirements as established by California State Statute:

> The governing board of any school district may grant the use of school building or grounds for public, literary, scientific, recreational, educational, or public agency meetings, or for the discussion of matters of general or public interest upon such terms and conditions as the board deems proper...(or) to any church or religious organization for the conduct of religious services for temporary periods where such church or organization has no suitable meeting place for the conduct of such services upon such terms and conditions as the board deems proper and subject to the limitations, requirements, and restrictions set forth in this chapter. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1656-1, the governing board shall charge the church or religious organization using such property for the conduct of religious services an amount at least sufficient to pay the cost to the district of supplies, utilities, and salaries paid the school district employees necessitated by such use of such property.

Section 16557 of the same statute authorized governing boards to present reasonable rules and regulations for the use of public schoolhouse or grounds and stipulates that such use shall not interfere with the use and occupancy of the properties for the established purpose of the public schools of the California (Finchum, 1967, p.12).

Missouri Statutes

The title of all schoolhouse sites and other school property and control in Missouri is vested in the district in which the property is located. All property leased or rented for school purposes is wholly under the control of the school board during such time. No board shall lease or rent any building for school purposes while district facilities are unoccupied, and no school house or school site shall be abandoned or sold until another site and house is provided for the school district (RSMO 177.011, 1992).

The school board having charge of the school houses, buildings, and grounds appurtenant thereto may allow the full use of houses, buildings, and grounds for the free discussion of public questions or subjects of general public interest for the meeting of organizations of citizens, and for any other civic, social, and educational purpose that will not interfere with the purpose to which the houses, buildings and grounds are devoted. If an application is granted and the use of the houses, buildings, or grounds is permitted for the purpose aforesaid, the school board may provide free of charge, heat, light, and janitor service therein when necessary, and may make any other provisions, free of charge, needed for the convenient and comfortable use of the houses, buildings, and grounds for such purpose, or the school boards may require the expenses to be paid by the organizations or persons who are allowed the use of houses, buildings, and grounds. All persons upon whose application or at whose request the use of any school house, building, or part thereof, or any grounds appurtenant thereto, is permitted as herein provided shall be jointly and severally liable for any injury or damage thereto which directly results from the use, ordinary wear and tear excepted (RSMO 177.031, 1992).

During the National Governors Conference in 1986,

Governor Ted Schwinden of Montana wrote:

> By 1991 we believe no community should be hampered by state laws or regulations in deciding how to make the fullest use of school buildings and property. The public school building in the United States represents an investment of $250 billion, yet these facilities are often under used and poorly maintained. Better use of school buildings means that students, the educational system, and the larger community will benefit. We have found that the overwhelming majority of the U.S. schools are used only five days a week for nine months a year and are restricted to the formal education of people between the ages of five and eighteen. This makes no sense. We need to talk to parents, community leaders, and people responsible for running the schools and encourage them to make the best use of existing facilities. We can insure that our laws and bureaucracies do not stand in the way of districts that would use their facilities to respond to the broader needs of their communities. Bringing people into the school for recreation, physical health, mental health, and library activities create greater understanding and interest. Some current laws and regulations discourage such common solutions (Schwinden, 1986, p. 223-4).

If the school offers a program of recreational, cultural, and educational services for school parents and other community adults, the school house will be utilized most of the time. A good program should be broad enough to utilize the plant far more than the traditional eight hours a day, five days a week, nine months a year. If non-school groups use the plant there will undoubtedly be greater consideration for

school property and less likelihood of damage (Keuscher, 1951, p.30).

A continuing demand for using school space for non-educational use in Seattle was substantiated by two surveys conducted by the Seattle Public Schools Facilities Utilization Study. These surveys sampled opinions of school principals, PTSA presidents, and selected community organizations in relation to non-educational use of space in elementary schools. The survey findings revealed that Seattle principals and PTSA presidents overwhelmingly supported the idea of allowing non-educational groups to use school facilities. In addition, there was generally strong citizen support for non-educational activities within schools in order to more fully use the buildings.

The first Executive Secretary of the National School Boards Association, E.M. Tuttle wrote "Provision Number Ten, Wider Use of Facilities" in The National School Boards Association Beliefs and Policies:

> In the public interest, The National School Boards Association advocates the greatest possible use of public school facilities and playgrounds as community centers for the integration of the American Community and the encouragement of family. Participation in wholesome character

> building activities conducive for good citizenship and the preservation of the American home. To this end, state associations are urged to initiate legislation whenever necessary to authorize the wider use of public school facilities for community purposes under provisions giving local boards authority to determine, regulate and maintain such programs (Tuttle, 1960, p. 280).

During the NSBA Delegate Assembly (1992) a resolution was presented and approved which read as follows concerning use of facilities:

> NSBA supports maximum use of public school facilities for public community education. NSBA urges school boards to develop programs that will provide for interaction between the school and the community, including those that provide day care and services for latchkey children, provided that these programs do not adversely affect the school districts' educational responsibilities.
>
> School districts can make a significant contribution to the community through permitting use of school facilities for community education programs that are responsive to the needs of working parents. Public schools are in a unique position to provide many of the services either directly or indirectly. In light of the large investment of local funds in the public school facilities, it becomes the duty of the school boards to strive to develop programs which will benefit the community as a whole.
>
> Further, the use of school buildings as community centers is efficient and may help avoid duplication in the construction of expensive facilities. Encouraging community access to the schools will increase community reliance on the schools, which can only lead to greater public respect and support for the educational system (Delegate Handbook NSBA, 1992, p. 3-131).

The NSBA developed another resolution during the (1992) delegate assembly that stated: NSBA opposes federal legislation and regulations that encroach on the authority of local school boards to assure that school boards determine the uses of school district classrooms and meeting facilities outside of regularly scheduled class time as well as during the regular class day.

Many citizens, educators, architects, urban planners, and sociologists believe that schools operate more effectively and the educational program is more productive when closely related to and used by all people of a community. School boards have made it possible for many pupils to walk to school by locating facilities centrally in attendance areas. The centralized location of facilities was necessary for the development of a widely used and strongly supported educational and activity center for people of all age groups within the community. Planning the school as a community center was an important aspect of long range planning. If schools were to be most suitably located in their communities the school board had a long term view of cultural and social, as well as educational

needs in each area. This long range site acquisition approach with concern for the school community concept was profitable not only in the attainment of school sites, but also in taking cognizance of other community problems (Schools for America, AASA, 1967, p.60).

Urban planners had to achieve reasonable balance in the use of community land not only for the needs of the schools, but also for highways, parking, and other needs of individuals and groups. Involving citizens and educators in the decision making process of allocating and making the best use of community land produced better, more satisfying and more productive results (Schools for America, AASA, 1967, p.60).

General Policy Statements

All organizations and systems are regulated by policy, and educational systems are no exception. Policy not only regulates the internal operations of a system but also serves to regulate relationships and defined functions among systems (Rich, 1974).

Policy is an important area in educational issues. Policy by its very nature can arouse controversy. This is due to the fact that policy statements establish a certain set of actions and are appropriate in certain

types of situations, thereby ruling out other possible actions.

Policy is also significant in terms of its relation to educational purpose. Certain regulating mechanisms are needed to control daily school operations in order that the system can attain its goals. Without regulations schools can barely be spoken of as a system. Through policy networks, orderly and predictable relationships are established and actions within the system are referred to as policy for interpretation and clarification.

The successful implementation of policy is dependent upon an effective communications network and a willingness of personnel to accept change. The act of rescinding, modifying, or establishing a new policy always brings a change to persons falling within the scope of the policy's application; and through frequent appraisal that change is an endemic feature of our time, resistance to policy changes is still commonly found (Rich, 1974, p. 79). Ambiguity, confusion, and trouble are avoided when policies are adopted and published. Clearly written policies, which reflect thorough research, sound judgement, and careful

planning can stave off the maiming accusations of uninformed critics.

Written policies helped do the following (NSBA, 1989):

1. Showed that the board was running a business like operation.

2. Gave credence to board actions. People tended to respect what is in writing, even though they may not agree with everything that is in the policy manual.

3. Established a legal record, as well as a legal basis, for many actions.

4. Fostered stability and continuity. Board and staff members may come and go, but the policy manual endured and helped assure smooth transitions when organizational or staff change occurred.

5. Gave the public a means to evaluate board performance.

6. Improved staff morale by facilitating fair and uniform treatment.

7. Aided in orienting new board members and staff members.

8. Provided a sound basis for appraisal and accountability, and facilitated the process of evaluating board and administration practice.

The board develops policy and procedures on every aspect of board operations. Major key policy areas that should be included in the school district policy

manual are school facilities and community use of these facilities.

Policy Issue of Building Usage

In a democratic society the public schools belong to the people. Policy makers should not proceed in a direction contrary to their wishes. This is as it should be, for educational policy is public policy, and in a democracy only the people can make public policy (Bortner, 1966, p. 62). Educational policy is the most important kind of public policy, because it affects every person, every interest, and every institution. Without public participation in policy making, school educational programs could not advance very far beyond prevailing public sentiment. Educational change and progress are largely dependent upon public understanding and support.

Public use of school properties can encourage goodwill toward the school if due regard is given to sound board of education policies, rules, and regulations governing such use. From the standpoint of exercising good management over school facilities, boards of education insure that well written, legally sound defensible policy regarding the use of school

facilities is included in all district policy manuals. The policy must be reviewed periodically and revised when necessary. A comprehensive policy, with detailed guidelines regarding conditions for usage of facilities and fee responsibility of user groups, creates better understanding by the public as to how the facilities are being managed and utilized.

In preparing statements of policy concerning extended usage of facilities, school boards have at their disposal the expertise of policy services offered by the National School Boards Association, (Policy Development, NSBA, 1984) as well as those of the various state school boards associations. These organizations offer well written legal guidelines and policy statements which can be adapted to the needs of local school districts and communities.

According to Akers, (1984) several important components are contained in school board policies relating to public use of facilities. A general statement of the board's philosophy and attitudes is a positive opening statement. Subsequent sections often provide detailed guidelines in the following areas:

1. Type of community and/or outside organizations which are permitted use of school facilities.

2. School district facility locations which are made available for public use.

3. General times and periods during the year when facilities are available to public groups.

4. Individual staff members who are responsible for granting use of facilities as well as procedure for engaging facility usage.

5. Special conditions and responsibilities of the user groups that conduct events on school property.

6. A schedule of fees and/or special charges for use of facility.

7. Provisions for a short written agreement or contract that contains the terms and conditions entered into by the use groups and the board of educations for each usage of the facility(s).

8. A statement regarding liability of user groups for damage to board of education property beyond normal wear and tear.

9. A statement regarding responsibility for adequate security and supervision of groups that utilized school facilities.

10. A statement regarding use of school facilities by religious groups or organizations which are consistent with state law.

11. When possible, a certificate of insurance or hold-harmless agreement must be provided by the person or organization using school facilities.

Once completed, the board's policy regarding usage of school facilities should be known at all levels of the system and community. The policy should be adhered to by all persons responsible for implementation. This policy is then applied to all applicants seeking to use facilities for non-school activities. A well developed policy enables the local board of education to effectively discharge its prime responsibility to the students by ensuring that the facilities of the district are available to execute the program of the district. Sound policy ensures an orderly process whereby the non-school groups, that support schools with tax dollars, may gain legitimate access to modern and well equipped school facilities (Akers, 1984).

Legal Issue of Facility Usage

From state to state, laws vary regarding legal uses of school facilities by non-school groups. What may be considered proper use of school funds and property in one state may be held to be improper use in another state (Reutter, 1970). When a community group or agency questions the practice of a school district, the ultimate recourse for change is through appeal to

the local school board. The policy-making power of the board can be questioned in the courts. If the court rules that board policy is in violation of current laws, the court can force the board to take appropriate actions to remedy the situation.

As of the turn of the century, legal restrictions prevented the use of school facilities for purposes other than education. School boards were required to spend school funds and use school facilities only for specifically defined educational purposes. It is a well established principle of law that public monies raised for one purpose cannot be diverted to another. The courts have not required boards to turn over the use of a school building to an outside group where there is a reasonable presumption that it would interfere with the school program (Nolte, 1966, p. 64).

On the question of whether a board could allow school buildings to be used for religious purposes, the courts are not in agreement. Some courts allow church use when it does not interfere with school activities and the use is infrequent or temporary. The courts have ordinarily not intervened to permit church usage in absence of a policy or statute unless the board

acted arbitrarily or capriciously in denying such use. In the case McCollun v. Board of Education of School District No.71, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the use of school buildings by the board of education for religious instruction during school time was in violation of the doctrine of separation of church and state amounting to an establishment of religion (Reutter, 1970, p. 39).

The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in Zorach v. Clausen that a released time arrangement off school premises during school hours for public school children was constitutional (Reutter, 1970 p. 41). Students were released from school by written consent of their parents and left the premises for religious instruction. From these cases, one can surmise that school buildings can not be utilized during school hours for religious instruction. In other cases the courts have decided that the use of school facilities by church groups on weekends was satisfactory, provided that appropriate fees are charged to offset the cost of operating the school facility.

There have been sharp differences among the courts regarding the extent to which boards could go in

allowing non-school use of public school facilities. These differences appear to be due in part to state statutes, customs, and philosophy of various locales (Garber, 1955). When no person in the community objects to extended usage of facilities and state statutes do not prohibit such usage, boards seem to have greater discretion in granting use of school facilities by non-school groups (Nolte, 1966).

The Fairfax Covenant Church brought action against the Fairfax County School Board, challenging the board's policy of charging the church more to use its facilities than other community groups. The United States District Court in Alexandria, Virginia, ruled that the board's policy of charging the church more to use its facilities than it charged other organizations violated the free speech clause of the First Amendment. The court ruled that the board had created an open or public forum by its policy of allowing and renting to a broad range of community groups. The court said the School Board did not violate the establishment clause of the First Amendment by permitting the church to use its facilities for religious purposes, where facilities

were open to other community groups (Fairfax Covenant Church v. Fairfax County School Board, 1993).

In the case Landis Chapel v County Moriches Union Free School District, the Supreme Court ruled that the school district violated the free speech clause of the First Amendment by denying the church access to school premises solely because a film dealt with family and child rearing issues from a religious standpoint. The court also ruled that allowing the church access to school premises would not have been an establishment of religion.

The court said allowing church access to the school premises to exhibit, for public viewing and for assertively religious purposes, a film dealing with family and child-rearing issues would not have been an establishment of religion, where the showing would not have been during school hours, would not have been sponsored by school, and would have been open to the public; moreover, there was nothing in the record to justify a claim that exclusion was justified on the grounds that allowing access to a "radical" church would lead to threats of public unrest and violence

(Landis Chapel v County Moriches Union Free School District, 1993).

The United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri upheld the School District of Ladue to allow a community group to utilize school district facilities upon application for a permit, after 6:00 p.m. on school days and after 8:00 a.m. on other days. The school district had previously allowed the Good News Sports Club, facility usage immediately after school. The Club had its roots in religious clubs for children and adolescents. The format of a typical Club meeting included opening prayer, snacks, activities, singing of Christian songs, a discussion based on a Bible reading, and a closing prayer. The Club is non-denominational and provided school age children an opportunity to experience constructive interaction with peers and to examine the moral values taught by Christianity. An additional purpose of the Club is to provide one means by which the parent sponsors of the Club can pass on their Christian religious beliefs to young persons.

After complaints about the Club from parents at a public meeting the Ladue Board of Education directed

its attorney to look into the issue of access by religious groups to the school district facilities and to examine the use of facility policy. The school district's attorney reported the existing use policy might violate the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. The Ladue Board amended the facility use policy to exclude facility usage to all groups except for, athletic facilities and usage by Scouts, Tiger Club, and Brownies between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on school days. The policy also excluded programs that involve speech or activity concerning religion or religious beliefs. The policy action was challenged in Good News Sports Club v The School District of the City of Ladue. The court ruled that the school district could create a non-public forum from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. The court also ruled that the school district acted within valid secular purpose to maintain the school facilities as a non-public forum from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. on school days and to avoid the appearance of taking any position other than neutrality on matters of public controversy. The primary effect of the district's amended use policy neither advanced nor inhibited religion. The policy is neutrally

applied to all religious, political, and philosophical groups (U.S. District Court E. District of MO 1993).

It appears that once a school board has decided to permit the use of school buildings by non-school groups, it must do so for all groups, regardless of their affiliation or beliefs (Nolte, 1966). The California Supreme Court ruled in American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California v. Board of Education of San Diego Unified School District that a loyalty oath, as a condition of public school facility usage, was improper (Reutter, 1970 p. 246). To prevent legal action against a school district in regards to the use of school facilities by non-school groups it is best to place policy regulation in writing.

Renting to Non-School Groups

Community groups expect school districts to use school facilities wisely, to provide for maximum availability to all, and to aid in improving the quality of living for all. The practice of renting facilities has been in the past related almost exclusively to after school, evening, weekend, and summer time use only. School districts sometimes allow surplus school space to be rented during school hours

when such rentals do not interfere with the ongoing educational programs in the facility.

Before renting school facilities to non-school groups, it is important to conduct a system-wide study to determine the feasibility of such a policy. This study should be designed to determine community needs and the availability of unused facilities to meet these needs. The principal and staff of each school need to be surveyed to determine their attitude and willingness to support such non-school group use (Davis, 1973). Community groups need to be surveyed for their opinions on contemplated school board policies and regulations.

In evaluating a school facility for community use, one must consider suitability of the facility, flexibility of space available, accessibility for non-school groups, appearance and safety, and economy of school operations for non-school activities. Non-school group use policies cannot be administered efficiently if prior planning has not been done carefully. A policy or regulation passed by the school board for extending the use of school facilities to non-school groups is of little value unless consistently and jointly administered, and it complies

with city, state, and federal law (Daste, 1982). Costs incurred by the renting of school district facilities must be pointed out in detail to all concerned. Updating the rental policies on an annual basis helps the board of education keep pace with economic conditions and thereby make appropriate policy and fee adjustment.

Various amounts may be charged for the rental of facilities as shown in Appendix D. Large school districts generally charge more and have more specific rental policies than do smaller districts. Samples of school districts' written policies and fee structures governing the use of school facilities by non-school groups were categorized by type of organization and type of activity for which they requested the facility (Daste, 1982). The Columbia Public School Policy (1993) concerning extended use of facilities, listed four classifications of organizations or meetings with a fee schedule.

The four classes of organization or meetings were noted as follows:

> Class I. Group of school employees, pupils, or parents meeting for activities related to the school program. Informational meeting with candidates for membership on the board of

education shall be considered within this class. No fee was charged except employees fee beyond the normal work day.

Class II. Nationally recognized youth organizations, such as scouts, campfire, and 4-H, for activities of said school district. No fee was charged except employee fee beyond normal work day.

Class III. Program and activities sponsored and directed by other governmental agencies. Programs sponsored by a local college or university. Organized groups of service, civic, or charitable nature. Fee varied per hour depending on space they rented.

Class IV. Other groups not included in above classes. Fees charged varied from $23 - $115 per three hour block, with additional per hour fee of $5.75 - $28.75 per hour depending upon space utilized.

In most cases, policies cite state statutes which apply to non-school group use of school facilities. Any district permitting use of facilities by non-school groups needs to have policies and regulations administered by a designated official. This official's job in part, is to minimize conflicts and confusion, protect the district against property loss and damage, assign service and supervisory personnel, handle the accounting for use applications, and collect fees (Finchum, 1967). The taxpayers and the school board should hold this official responsible for guaranteeing use of tax dollars as intended by taxpayers. Whenever

school tax dollars go to supplement a non-school group's use of school facilities, there can surface serious reasons for concern (Shaw, 1949).

Extended Usage of School Facilities Concerns

When community groups fail to understand or comply with school board policies and regulations as they use school facilities, a number of problems can develop. Many problems arise if school personnel are not on hand to make decisions to protect the interests of the school district. Millions of dollars worth of facilities opened for non-school groups could be subjected to abuse. Another problem may be that principals sometimes have the attitude that they are the manager of their school during school hours only, so many principals discourage non-school group activities (Keuscher & Martin, 1951).

The following list of problems was compiled from a number of studies which raised questions about the propriety of policies regarding the use of school facilities by non-school groups (Daste, 1982; Deselms, 1978).

1. Policies were generally established as to the kind of groups that could use school facilities.

2. Policies were often restrictive and did not allow for flexibility for which school facilities could be used.

3. Policies which required the renter to pay all cost prevented some groups from being able to use school facilities.

4. Relatively few school district policies provided for shared planning with community representative for the use of school facilities by non-school groups.

5. Policies are often changed only after school board decisions were challenged in court.

6. Policies often did not provide effective requirements for leadership and supervision of facilities in use by non-school groups.

7. Policies and standard operating procedures had not been updated to deal with the concept of community education.

8. Policies did not reflect sincere cooperation with other public agencies in regard to sharing facilities.

9. Policies often did not encourage teachers or other staff to support non-school use of school facilities.

10. Policies generally forbid smoking, drinking, and gambling in school facilities.

11. Policies generally limit the hours of availability of school facilities to before and after school, weekends, and evenings.

12. Interpretation of what to charge, as costs to non-school groups, varied greatly from district to district.

School board policies which ban gambling, smoking, drinking, and eating by non-school groups in school

facilities are difficult to enforce. It is difficult to establish and maintain good relations between community groups and school staffs when damage occurs which detracts from the appearance of the facility and prevents or interrupts normal operation of the educational program. In times of limited funds for supervisory services and repairs due to abuse, it is even more important to have close cooperation between the school board and non-school groups using facilities (Daste, 1982).

Community Education Uses of School Facilities

It appears that many people in communities all over the country see the logic in the school as a base for extending educational opportunities and assisting with the solutions of social problems. The demands of communities call for some institutions to assume new leadership and service functions in the social structure. Public schools seem to offer the most parsimonious solution to this dilemma. These demands include: a call for greater use of public school facilities; adaptation of some form of educational accountability; the right of adults to learn to read and write and obtain a high school diploma; attention

to social problems; provisions for higher education, recreation, vocational training, avocational training, avocational interest, and social activities; attention to the needs of senior citizens; better communications; and community involvement in the educational decision making process (Minzey 1972).

The definition of community education has passed through several phases. It is probably accurate to say that early definitions were comparatively limited in their potential impact as compared with more recent conceptualizations. Community education, in its earlier stages, tended to define limited programs such as recreation or extra programs for adults and children. As such, they tended to deal with programs tacked on to the existing curriculum. The initial rationale for the existence of community education was based on the improvement of the regular school program.

According to Minzey (1972, p.152), the later definition of community education defined it as an educational philosophy which permeates basic beliefs. It enlarges and enhances the role of the public school so that it is quite different from before. The school becomes responsible for all aspects of education as it

relates to the community. The school, however, does not become all things to all people. It attempts to recognize the needs of the community and to act as the coordinator, facilitator, or initiator to see that these needs are met. The school plays a catalytic role, serving an organization function in community education.

It is probably appropriate to point out the relationship between community education and "community school." Community education is the educational concept; community school is the vehicle by which many services of community education are delivered. The community school becomes the device through which community needs are matched with community facilities and programs developed either by the schools or by other agencies and groups within the community. The responsibility for coordinating this function of relating needs to programs becomes that of the school.

Expansion of School Roles and Facility Uses

In New York, some elementary schools are being reorganized to remain open as late as 10:00 p.m. every day, including weekends. These schools offer breakfast, lunch, dinner, health care, job training,

family counseling, parenting courses, tutoring, community recreation, adult education, and even tax preparation instructions (Quinn, 1992). New York City's response to families in need is not unique. San Diego offers space in its elementary schools for family social workers, child welfare workers, and psychologists. More and more school districts are offering parents courses in child development.

Many of these initiatives, while not primarily related to the traditional school curriculum, are related to the well-being of children. This expanding role of the elementary school raises some fundamental questions as to the purpose of schools. Are they simply institutions to transmit the basic skills of reading, writing, and math, or are the schools destined to become omnibus social service agencies providing for the intellectual, physical, emotional, and social well-being of our children and their family?

Summary

Facility usage by non-school groups dates back to the very beginning of public schools. Public discussion, elections, social gatherings, and a variety of activities have been allowed in public school

facilities. The courts have maintained a separation of church and state in relation to the establishment of religion. The courts have ruled it is permissible for church groups to utilize public school facilities as long as the regular school program was not interfered with and a fee was paid for extra cost incurred by the school district. The laws of the states vary in that some have specific statutes allowing extended use of facilities and other states mandate a separation of church and state along very rigid lines.

If a school board allows extended use of school facilities by non-school groups, it then has to be consistent with all approved groups. One person in the school district should be appointed to oversee the implementation of non-school use policies. This person is responsible for protecting the interests of the school district.

Some policies are difficult to enforce and a lack of adequate supervision is among the main concerns about non-school use of facilities by school staff members. Close cooperation, supervision, and adequate policies communicated to all concerned can prevent many problems.

Community education developed in the 1930's in Flint, Michigan, and evolved to many school districts throughout the country. Community education reached its peak in the early 1970's and remains a popular program in many schools.

Programs at elementary schools are being developed for children that greatly expand the use of school facilities. Day care, social services, health services, parenting classes were a few of the activities schools were participating in that expanded use of school facilities by non-school groups.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a discussion of the research methodology incorporated in this study. The design components investigated in this study are restated. Information about methodology, including population, sample, data collection, and instrumentation, is provided. The statistical treatment for data analysis is identified.

Population and Sample

This study was directed to the superintendent of schools or a designated central administrative officer of each district. It was reasoned that the superintendent's office would be the logical office to have the research information needed. This study covered the 1992-93 school year and dealt specifically with written policies regarding the use of public school facilities by non-school groups and the fees charged for such use.

The sample was drawn from a group of districts originally by Wells (1979) in his study of school

policies on corporal punishment. Wells (1979) numbered each public school district in Missouri then drew the sample by applying a table of random numbers prepared by The Rand Corporation (1955).

The sample used by Wells (1979) was most recently used again by Jones (1988) for a policy study on communicable disease policies in Missouri Public Schools offering K-12 programs. School districts offering only elementary programs were omitted from the original sample of 200 school districts utilized by Wells (1979). Through this process the sample utilized by Jones (1988) was reduced to 168 of the 453 comprehensive high schools districts.

Because this study sought policy information from schools offering K-12 program, the sample of 168 schools in Jones (1988) study was utilized. The sample utilized by Jones (1988) was reduced by two school districts due to consolidation to other school districts and one due to a name change. The population sample used for this study was 165 K-12 Missouri Public School Districts which are listed in Appendix E.

Development of the Instrument

Because no instrument was available which could solicit the information that was needed for this study. Therefore, it was necessary to develop a questionnaire to be used in the study.

The survey of Missouri Public School District Policies on Public School Facility Usage by non-school groups, was developed after extensive reading and a survey of related literature. Discussion was held with advisors and peer professionals to obtain their advice. Different types of questionnaires were examined for ideas before formulating the questionnaire for this study. Items selected for use in the questionnaire came as a result of a combination of these efforts.

The instrument used in this study can be found in Appendix A and the letters that accompanied the mailings are in Appendix B. Unidentified copies of the policies and fees concerning facility usage by non-school groups are found in Appendices C and D. A list of the 165 school districts used in the study are presented in Appendix E.

Collection of the Data

The questionnaire, cover letter, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope were sent to the superintendent in each of the 165 school districts included in the sample. The first mailing was completed on July 15, 1993, and a second mailing for those not returned was completed on August 5, 1993. On August 26, 1993, a third mailing was sent to schools that had not completed the survey instrument and personal telephone calls were made to these districts on August 30, and 31, 1993, to solicit a response to the third mailing.

Each questionnaire was numbered prior to its mailing and coded to a master list in order that additional communication and follow-up could occur for those who had not responded within three weeks. A second follow-up mailing was sent to non- respondents after three weeks. A third follow-up mailing was sent to non-respondents after six weeks. Thus, data collection was conducted within a span of nine weeks.

Processing the Data

The responses to the questionnaire items were recorded as frequency totals and converted to

percentages when appropriate, then there presented in summary tables to facilitate review and analysis of data. Additional comments and explanations that were pertinent to the study were utilized to help interpret the results of the questionnaire and were reported in tables or in narrative description when deemed appropriate.

The policies received from the school districts were individually examined and analyzed in order to answer the research questions posed in the study. The combination of the questionnaire responses and careful examination of the policies provided the data for this study. The data are presented in narrative form, with tables to facilitate analysis.

A chi-square test was utilized to determine if the school districts having written policies in effect regarding use of school facilities by non-school groups differentiated from those with no such policies relative to district enrollment, state classification status (AAA, AA, Unclassified, Accredited, Provisional Accreditation, Unaccredited), membership in the Missouri School Boards Association, and classification as being metropolitan or outstate districts. Also, on

the basis of observed frequencies and percentages of response data, additional chi square analyses were used to determine if observed differences were statistically significant at the .05 level.

Summary

This chapter was devoted to the research procedures utilized in this study. The population sample selection was discussed and the individual in each school district to whom the survey was directed was identified. Since no instrument was available to solicit the information needed for this study a survey was developed by the researcher. The survey was pilot tested with twelve school districts and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to solicit comments and advice concerning the survey instrument. The school districts in the pilot study were of various sizes and located throughout Missouri. As a result of the pilot study, question number two concerning classification of each school district was expanded from three categories to six categories. This change was necessary due to classification changes in Missouri Public Schools. Also, question nineteen was expanded to find out if public schools allowed alcoholic

beverages on school property by non-school groups. The collection process for the data and the treatment of that data was discussed. The written policies and fees for non-school group usage of public school facilities were individually examined and analyzed according to the questions raised in this study. Data provided by the questionnaire and the written policies and fees formed the basis of this study.

Table 1

Research Design/Variable Matrix

Research Question	Variables Dependent/Independent	Data Dependent/ Independent	Statistical Treatment
	Categorical	Categorical	
Ho1		Policy	
1.1	Size of School District	(yes/no)	Chi-Square
1.2	Classification	(yes/no)	Chi-Square
1.3	Metropolitan or Outstate	(yes/no)	Chi-Square
1.4	Member of Missouri School Boards Association	(yes/no)	Chi-Square
Ho2		Fees Charged	
2.1	Size of School District	(yes/no)	Chi-Square
2.2	Classification	(yes/no)	Chi-Square
2.3	Metropolitan or Outstate	(yes/no)	Chi-Square
2.4	Member of Missouri School Boards Association	(yes/no)	Chi-Square

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the study. Included are the findings from each of the twenty questions that were presented in Chapter I. The data were compiled from the returned questionnaires, copies of building use policies, and copies of fee schedules as provided by the school superintendents included in the study sample.

Results

The survey instrument requested information regarding local districts' policies covering non-school groups usage of public school facilities. The survey was sent to the superintendents of 165 Missouri K-12 Public School Districts. Replies were received from 151 districts for a 91.5 percent return. One hundred and forty nine districts provided usable surveys. Some of the respondents did not answer all items. Two districts elected not to participate, one district's survey was received after the nine weeks collection period, and fourteen districts did not respond to the survey. A copy of the survey instrument is found in

Appendix A. Table Two presents a breakdown of responses by frequency of response according to the descriptors of enrollment, classification, membership in Missouri School Boards Association, and demographic location of metropolitan or outstate.

In addition to the questionnaire, policies and fees pertaining to non-school use of facilities were requested. Ninety-one school superintendents returned a copy of their districts' facility usage policy and forty-seven school district superintendents returned fee structures relating to non-school use of facilities. The returned policies and fee structures varied greatly throughout the state. A sample of non-school facility use policies are listed in Appendix C and fees charged for non-school use are listed in Appendix D.

Null Hypotheses

Two major hypotheses related to the research questions were generated by the statement of the problem.

Ho1 There are no significant differences between school districts with written policies on non-school group usage of school facilities and those

without such policies based on the following school district variables:

Ho1 1.1 School size (student enrollment) A chi-square test using the incidence of school size on the basis of written policies was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant relationship between the current number of students enrolled in a school district and whether the school district had written policies that governed non-school use of school facilities. Of the 145 respondents to the question on the existence of written policies concerning non-school use of facilities, 135 answered "yes" and ten answered "no" when asked whether their school had written policies that governed non-school use of school facilities. The ten "no" responses were all from schools with student populations of fewer than 1800. Using a .05 level of significance, no relationship was found between the current number of students enrolled in a district and whether or not that district had written policies governing non-school use of facilities.

HO1 1.2 School Classification

A chi-square test using the incidence of school classification on the basis of the existence of written

Table 2

Frequencies and percentage of school district responses by descriptors, enrollment, classification, membership in Missouri School Boards Association, and metropolitan or outstate locations. N = 149

Description	Response Frequency	Percentage
Question #1. Enrollment		
a. Fewer than 200	12	8.1
b. 200-499	43	28.9
c. 500-799	21	14.1
d. 800-1199	16	10.7
e. 1200-1799	19	12.8
f. 1800-2399	6	4.0
g. 2400-4999	21	14.1
h. 5000-9999	5	3.4
i. 10000 and above	5	3.4
j. Missing	1	.7
Question #2. Present Classification		
a. U	2	1.3
b. AA	61	40.9
c. AAA	62	41.6
d. Accredited	19	12.8
e. Provisional Accreditation	4	2.7
f. Missing	1	.7
Question #3. Missouri School Boards Association Membership		
a. Yes	133	89.3
b. No	15	10.1
c. Missing	1	.7
Question #4. Population Status		
a. Metropolitan	29	19.5
b. Outstate	120	80.5

policies concerning non-school use of facilities was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant relationship between the present classification of a school district and whether or not the school district had written policies that governed non-school use of school facilities. Of the 145 respondents to the question concerning the existence of written policies, 135 answered "yes" and ten answered

Table 3

Incidence of written policies on the basis of school district classification; Chi-Square Analysis

Classification	Written Policies Yes	No	Row Total	Percent
U	2	0	2	1.4
AA	51	8	59	40.7
AAA	59	2	61	42.1
Accredited	19	0	19	13.1
Provisional Accredited	4	0	4	2.8
Column: Total	135	10	145	
Percent	93.1	6.9		100

Chi-Square Analysis	Value	df	Significance
Pearson	7.17442	4	.12695
Likelihood Ratio	8.34015	4	.07988

"no" when asked whether their school had written policies that governed non-school use of school facilities. The ten "no" responses were all from schools with an AA or AAA Classification. Using a .05 level of significance, no relationship was found between the classification of a district and whether or not that district had written policies governing non-school use of facilities.

HO1 1.3 Missouri School Boards Association Membership

A chi-square test using the incidence of written policies on the basis of membership in the Missouri School Boards Association was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant relationship between whether a school district was a member of the Missouri School Boards Association and whether the school district had written policies that governed non-school use of facilities. Of the 145 respondents, 122 answered "yes" to both the question of membership in the Missouri School Boards Association and the existence of written policies concerning non-school use of facilities, 13 answered "no" to the question concerning membership in Missouri School Boards Association and "yes" to the question concerning the

existence of written policies, 8 answered "yes" to membership in Missouri School Boards Association and "no" to the existence of written policies concerning non-school use of facilities, and two answered "no" to both. Using a .05 level of significance, no relationship was found between membership in the Missouri School Boards Association and whether or not that district had written policies governing non-school use of facilities.

HO1 1.4 Population Status (Metropolitan or Outstate)

A chi-square test using metropolitan code on the basis of incidence of the existence of written policies allowing non-school use of facilities was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant relationship between whether a school district was in a metropolitan or outstate area and whether the school district had written policies that governed non-school use of school facilities. Of the 145 respondents, 27 in metropolitan areas answered "yes" to the question concerning the existence of written policies, and one respondent from a metropolitan area answered "no" to the question about existence of written policies.

There were 108 outstate respondents who answered "yes" to the question concerning existence of written policies allowing non-school use of facilities and nine

Table 4

Incidence of written policies on the Basis of Membership in MSBA: Chi-Square Analysis

MSBA Member		Written Policies Yes	No	Row Total	Percent
Yes		122	8	130	89.7
No		13	2	15	10.3
Column:	Total	135	10	145	
	Percent	93.1	6.9		100

Chi-Square Analysis	Value	df	Significance
Pearson	7.17442	4	.12695
Likelihood Ration	8.34015	4	.07988

who answered "no". Using a .05 level of significance, no relationship was found between whether a school was in a metropolitan area or outstate and whether or not that district had written policies governing non-school use of facilities.

H02 There are no significant differences between school districts which charge for non-school usage of facilities and those that do not charge, based on the following school district variables.

H02.1 School Size (Student Enrollment)

A chi-square test using the size of the school district and the incidence of fees charged for non-school use of facilities was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant relationship between the current enrollment in a school district and whether a school district charged fees for non-school group usage of facilities. Of the 145 respondents, 125 answered that they did charge fees and twenty answered that they did not charge fees. The no fee answers all came from districts with a school student enrollment of fewer than 1200. Using a .05 level of significance, a significant relationship was found between the larger the enrollment in a school district and the more likely a school district charged for non-school group usage of facilities.

HO2.2 School Classification

A chi-square test using the classification of the school district and the incidence of fees charged for non-school use of facilities was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant relationship between the present classification of a school district and whether a school district charged fees for non-school group usage of facilities. Of the 145

respondents, 125 answered that they did charge fees and 20 answered that they did not charge fees. Of the respondents who charged fees, 61 were from AAA districts, 42 were from AA districts, 2 from unclassified districts, 17 from accredited districts, and 3 from provisionally accredited districts. For those districts charging no fees, 1 was from AAA, 16 from AA districts, 2 from accredited districts, and 1 from a provisionally accredited district. Using a .05 level of significance, a significant relationship was

Table 5

Incidence of fees charged for non-school use on the basis of school size (student enrollment): Chi-Square Analysis

Student Enrollment	Fees Charged Yes	No	Row Total	Percent
Fewer than 500	37	16	53	36.6
500-1199	32	4	36	24.8
1200 and above	56	0	56	38.6
Column: Total	125	20	145	
Percent	86.2	13.8		100

Chi-Square Analysis	Value	df	Significance
Pearson	21.15966	2	.00003
Likelihood Ratio	26.30897	2	.00000

found between the present school district classification of AA and a school district charges fees for non-school group usage of facilities.

HO2.3 Missouri School Boards Association Membership

Table 6

Incidence of fees charged for non-school use on the Basis of school district classification: Chi-Square Analysis

Classification	Fees Charged Yes	No	Row Total	Percent
U	2	0	2	1.4
AA	42	16	58	40.0
AAA	61	1	62	42.8
Accredited	17	2	19	13.1
Provisional Accredited	3	1	4	2.8
Column: Total	125	20	145	
Percent	86.2	13.8		100

Chi-Square Analysis	Value	df	Significance
Pearson	17.92667	4	.00127
Likelihood Ratio	20.49719	4	.00040

A chi-square test using the incidence of membership in Missouri School Boards Association and charging of fees for non-school use of facilities was conducted in order to determine if there was a

significant relationship between membership in the Missouri School Boards Association and whether a school district charged fees for non-school group usage of facilities. There were 115 school districts that were members of the Missouri School Boards Association that

Table 7

Incidence of fees charged for non-school group usage on the basis of school district membership in MSBA: Chi-Square Analysis

		Fees Charged		Row	
MSBA Membership		Yes	No	Total	Percent
Yes		115	15	130	89.7
No		10	5	15	10.3
Column:	Total	125	20	145	
	Percent	86.2	13.8		100

Chi-Square Analysis	Value	df	Significance
Pearson	5.37244	1	.02046
Likelihood Ratio	4.26657	1	.03887

charged fees for non-school group usage of facilities and 10 who did not. Of those districts that were not members of Missouri School Boards Association, 15 charged fees and 5 did not. Using a .05 level of significance, a significant relationship was found between membership in the Missouri School Boards

Association and charging fees for non-school group usage of facilities.

HO2.4 Population Status (Metropolitan or Outstate)

A chi square test using the population status of a school district and the incidence of charging fees for

Table 8

Incidence of fees charged for non-school use on the basis of metropolitan or outstate location: Chi-Square Analysis

	Fees Charged		Row	
	Yes	No	Total	Percent
Metropolitan	27	2	29	20.0
Outstate	98	18	116	80.0
Column: Total	125	20	143	
Percent	86.2	13.8		100

Chi-Square Analysis	Value	df	Significance
Pearson	1.45000	1	.22853
Likelihood Ratio	1.66377	1	.19710

non-school use of facilities was conducted in order to determine if there was a significant relationship between whether a school was located in a metropolitan or outstate area and whether a school district charged fees for non-school group usage of facilities. Of the 145 respondents there were 27 districts from

metropolitan areas that charged fees and 2 that did not. In the outstate group, 98 districts charged fees and 18 did not. Using a .05 level of significance, no relationship was found between location of the school district and charging fees for non-school group usage of facilities.

The following is a summary of questions number seven through question number 20. Data regarding frequencies and percentages are presented in table 9.

Question 7. **Do the fees charged cover district expenses for the following items?**

Custodial service	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Supervisory personnel	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Utility cost	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Security cost	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Capital outlay	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Other	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A

Of the 149 school districts, 108 districts or 81.2 percent indicated that fees covered custodial service. Only 18 districts or 13.5 percent indicated that the fee did not cover custodial service. Of the 149 school districts 7 or 5.3 percent indicated that fees were not applicable. There were 16 districts or 10.7 percent not responding to this sub-question.

There were 35 districts or 23.5 percent reporting that fees charged covered the cost of supervision for

non-school activities. Sixty-four districts or 43 percent reported that fees charged did not cover supervision expenses. Nineteen districts or 12.8 percent responded supervision expenses were not applicable. There were 31 districts or 20.8 percent that did not respond to this sub-question.

Of the 149 districts, 92 or 61.7 percent reported that fees covered building utility costs. Twenty-five districts or 16.8 percent reported that fees did not cover utility costs. There were 8 districts or 5.1 percent that reported utility costs or not applicable since no building usage fees were charged. Twenty-four districts or 16.1 percent did not respond on this sub-question.

Of the 149 districts, 22 or 14.8 percent reported that fees charged covered security costs. Seventy districts or 47.0 percent reported that fees charged did not cover security costs. Twenty-one districts or 14.1 percent reported that security costs were not applicable. Thirty-six districts or 24.7 percent did not respond to the sub-question.

Of the 149 districts 14 or 9.4 percent reported that fees charged covered capital outlay expenses.

Seventy-five districts or 50.3 percent reported that fees did not cover capital outlay expenses. Twenty district or 13.4 percent reported capital outlay expenses as not applicable. Forty districts or 26.6 percent did not respond to the sub-question.

Question 8. Does your school district have different rates for different types of groups?

A. Yes B. No

Of the 141 districts that responded to the question, 56 districts or 37.6 per cent charged different rates for different groups, 85 districts did not charge different rates for different groups, and eight districts or 5.4 per cent did not answer the question.

Question 9. How often are district policies covering extended use of school facilities by non-school groups reviewed by the board?

A. Once a year
B. Once every two years
C. Once every three years
D. Once every four years
E. Once every five years
F. No scheduled review

Of the 146 school districts responding to the question, 41 districts or 27.5 percent review the policies every year, 8 districts or 5.4 percent review the policies every two years, 11 districts or 7.4

Table 9

Frequencies and percentages of school districts responses to question #7 through question #20. N=149

Questionnaire Item	Response	Frequency	Percentage
7. Do the fees charged cover district expense for the following items?			
	Custodial Service		
a.	Yes	108	72.5
b.	No	18	12.1
c.	N/A	7	4.7
d.	No response	16	10.7
	Supervisory Personnel		
a.	Yes	35	23.5
b.	No	64	43.6
c.	N/A	19	12.8
d.	No response	31	20.8
	Utility Cost		
a.	Yes	92	61.7
b.	No	25	16.8
c.	N/A	8	5.4
d.	No response	24	16.1
	Security Cost		
a.	Yes	22	14.8
b.	No	70	47.0
c.	N/A	21	14.1
d.	No response	36	24.2
	Capital Outlay		
a.	Yes	14	9.4
b.	No	75	50.3
c.	N/A	20	13.4
d.	No response	40	26.8
	Other Expenses		
a.	Yes	12	8.1
b.	No	135	90.6
c.	N/A	0	0
d.	No response	2	1.3

Table 9 continued

Frequencies and percentages of school districts responses to question #7 through question #20. N=149

Questionnaire Item	Response Frequency	Percentage
8. Does your school district have different rates for different types of groups?		
Different Rates		
a. Yes	56	37.6
b. No	85	57.0
c. No response	8	5.4
9. How often are district policies covering extended school facilities by non-school group usage reviewed by the board? (N=149)		
a. Once a year	41	27.5
b. Once every two years	8	5.4
c. Once every three years	11	7.4
d. Once every four years	2	1.3
e. Once every five years	7	4.7
f. No scheduled review	77	51.7
g. No response	3	2.0
10. Who is the school district person responsible for administering policies regarding non-school usage of school facilities?		
a. Superintendent	83	55.7
b. Assistant Superintendent	13	8.7
c. Director of Buildings & Grounds	7	4.7
d. Principal	18	12.1
e. Head Custodian	0	0
f. Other	25	16.8
g. No response	3	2.0
11. Does your school district execute a formal contract with non-school groups utilizing school district facilities?		
a. Yes	87	58.4
b. No	60	40.3
c. No response	2	1.3

Table 9 continued

Frequencies and percentages of school districts responses to question #7 through question #20. N=149

Questionnaire Item	Response	Frequency	Percentage
12. Does your district require the requesting group to be organized eg: incorporated, officers by law?			
a.	Yes	24	16.3
b.	No	123	83.7
c.	No response	2	1.3
13. Does your district require the requesting group to have insurance protecting the district?			
a.	Yes	43	30.3
b.	No	99	69.7
c.	No response	7	4.7
14. Does your district have a minimum age requirement for the person signing or requesting the use of school facilities? If yes the minimum age___?			
a.	Yes	87	58.4
b.	No	58	38.9
c.	No response	4	2.7
Minimum age N=83			
a.	16 years	1	
b.	18 years	25	
c.	19 years	2	
d.	21 years	55	
15. Does your school district restrict non-school use of facilities to residents of the school district?			
a.	Yes	69	46.3
b.	No	75	50.3
c.	No response	5	3.4

Table 9 continued

Frequencies and percentages of school districts responses to question #7 through question #20. N=149

Questionnaire Item	Response	Frequency	Percentage
16. Does your school district allow non-school group usage of facilities during the following times? (Please answer each item)			
	7am - 4:00pm School days		
a.	Yes	19	12.8
b.	No	126	84.6
c.	No response	4	2.7
	7am - 4:00pm Non-school work days		
a.	Yes	122	81.9
b.	No	24	16.1
c.	No response	3	2.0
	4:00pm - midnight		
a.	Yes	132	88.6
b.	No	12	8.1
c.	No response	5	3.4
	Legal Holidays		
a.	Yes	86	57.7
b.	No	58	38.9
c.	No response	5	3.4
	Midnight - 7:00am		
a.	Yes	38	25.5
b.	No	103	69.1
c.	No response	8	5.4
	Saturday 7:00am - 12:00am		
a.	Yes	136	91.3
b.	No	10	6.7
c.	No response	3	2.0
	Sunday 7:00am - 12:00pm		
a.	Yes	96	64.4
b.	No	49	37.9
c.	No response	4	2.7

Table 9 continued

Frequencies and percentages of school districts responses to question #7 through question #20. N=149

Questionnaire Item	Response	Frequency	Percentage
	Sunday 12:01pm - Midnight		
a.	Yes	99	66.4
b.	No	44	29.5
c.	No response	6	4.0
17.	Does your school district allow for profit non-school use of school facilities?		
a.	Yes	72	48.3
b.	No	75	50.3
c.	No response	2	1.3
18.	Does your school district have a reciprocal agreement with another agency for extended use of facilities?		
a.	Yes	30	20.1
b.	No	118	79.2
c.	No response	1	.7
19.	Does your school district allow usage of the following products on school property by non-school groups?		
	Tobacco or tobacco products		
a.	Yes	20	13.4
b.	No	127	85.2
c.	No response	2	1.3
	Alcoholic beverages		
a.	Yes	3	2.0
b.	No	144	96.6
c.	No response	2	1.3
20.	Are there facilities within your district that are not available for non-school use?		
a.	Yes	65	43.6
b.	No	80	53.7
c.	No response	4	2.7

Table 9 continued

Frequencies and percentages of school districts responses to question #7 through question #20. N=149

Questionnaire Item	Response Frequency	Percentage

A listing of facilities not available for non-school group usage is as follows: listed most frequently to least frequently.

Space	Frequency	Space	Frequency
a. office	19	m. warehouse	2
b. classrooms	16	n. storage area	1
c. gym	16	o. lawn areas	1
d. shop/vocational	12	p. typing areas	1
e. bus facilities	9	q. teachers area	1
f. computer areas	8	r. elementary building	1
g. science non/labs	8	s. high school building	1
h. cafeteria/kitchen	6	t. administration building	1
i. special classrooms	3	u. general service center	1
j. library	2	v. high school commons	1
k. main building	2	w. weight room	1
l. boiler room	1	x. drivers education room	1

percent review the policies every three years, 2 districts or 1.3 percent review the policies every four years, and 7 districts or 4.7 percent review the policies every five years. Seventy-seven districts or 51.7 percent do not carry out a scheduled review of their policies. There were three districts or 2 percent which did not answer this question.

Question 10. Who is the school district person responsible administering out policies regarding non-school use of school facilities?

A. Superintendent
B. Asst. Supt.
E. Head Custodian
F. Other please list_____

C. Dir. Bldgs. & Grounds
D. Principal

Of the 146 districts responding to the question, 83 districts or 55.7 percent indicated the superintendent was responsible for policy administration. Thirteen districts or 8.7 percent indicated that the assistant superintendent was responsible, 7 districts or 4.7 percent indicated that the director of buildings and grounds was responsible, 18 districts or 12.1 percent indicated that the principal was responsible, no districts responded that the head custodian was responsible, and 25 districts responded that other persons were responsible for facility usage policy administration. Three districts or 2.0 percent did not respond to this question.

Question 11. **Does your school district execute a formal contract with non-school groups utilizing district facilities?**

A. Yes B. No

Of the 147 districts responding to the question, 87 districts or 58.4 percent execute a formal contract, 60 districts or 40.3 percent do not execute a formal contract, and 2 districts of 1.3 percent did not respond to the question.

Question 12. **Does your district require the requesting group to be organized? eg: Incorporated, Officers, By-Laws.**

A. Yes B. No.

Of the 147 districts responding to the question, 24 districts or 16.1 percent require the group to be organized, 123 districts or 82.6 percent did not require the group to be organized, and 2 districts or 1.3 percent did not respond to the question.

Question 13. **Does your district require the requesting group to have insurance protecting the school district?**

A. Yes B. No

Of the 142 districts responding, 43 districts or 28.9 percent required the group to have insurance, 99 districts or 66.4 percent of the districts do not require insurance, and 7 districts or 4.7 per cent did not respond to the question.

Question 14. **Does your district have a minimum age requirement for the person signing or requesting the usage of school facilities?**

A. Yes B. No

Of the 145 districts responding, 87 or 58.4 percent required a minimum age to sign or request facility usage, 58 district or 38.9 percent did not have a minimum age requirement, and 4 districts or 2.7 percent did not respond to the question. Of the 83 districts completing the age of the person signing or requesting the facility usage, 1 district or 1.2 percent required a minimum of 16 years of age, 25 districts or 30.1 percent required a minimum age of 18 years, 2 districts or 2.4 percent required minimum age of 19 years, and 55 districts or 66.3 percent required a minimum age of 21 years.

Question 15. Does your school district restrict non-school group usage of facilities to residents of the school district?

A. Yes B. No

Of the 144 districts responding, 69 district or 46.3 percent required the group to be residents of the district, 75 districts or 50.3 percent did not require the group to be residents of the district, and 5 districts or 3.4 percent did not respond to the question.

Question 16. **Does your district allow non-school groups usage of facilities during the following times? (Please answer each item)**

7:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. school days	A. Yes	B. No
7:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. non school work day	A. Yes	B. No
4:00 p.m.-Midnight	A. Yes	B. No
Legal Holidays	A. Yes	B. No
Midnight - 7:00 a.m.	A. Yes	B. No
Saturday - 7:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	A. Yes	B. No
Sunday - 7:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	A. Yes	B. No
Sunday - 12:01 p.m. - midnight	A. Yes	B. No

Of the 145 school districts responding to the question concerning use of facilities from 7:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. on school days, 19 districts or 12.8 percent allowed usage, 126 districts or 84.6 percent do not allow usage during the school day, and 4 districts or 2.7 percent did not respond to the sub-question. Of the 146 school districts responding to the question concerning non-school usage during non-school days from 7:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m., 122 districts or 81.9 percent allowed usage, 24 districts or 16.1 percent do not allow usage, and 3 districts or 2.0 percent did not respond to the question.

Of the 144 school districts responding to the question concerning usage of facilities from 4:00 p.m. to midnight, 132 districts or 88.6 percent allow usage, 12 districts or 8.1 percent do not allow usage, and 5

districts or 3.4 percent did not respond to the question.

Of the 144 districts responding to facility usage during legal holidays, 86 districts or 57.7 percent allow usage, 58 district or 38.9 percent do not allow usage, and 5 districts or 3.4 percent did not respond to the question.

Of the 146 districts responding to the question of usage from midnight to 7:00 a.m., 38 district or 25.5 percent allow usage during this time, 108 districts do not allow usage during this time, and 8 districts or 5.4 percent did not respond to the question.

Of the 146 districts responding to the question about facility usage on Saturdays from 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., 136 districts or 91.3 percent allow usage of facilities, 10 districts or 6.7 percent do not allow usage, and 3 districts or 2.0 percent did not respond to the question.

Of the 145 districts responding to the question of usage on Sunday from 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., 96 districts or 64.4 percent allow usage of facilities, 49 districts or 32.9 percent do not allow usage, and 4

district or 2.7 percent did not respond to the question.

Of the 143 districts responding to the question of Sunday usage of facilities from 12:01 p.m. to midnight, 99 districts or 66.4 percent allow usage, 44 districts or 29.5 percent do not allow usage, and 6 districts or 4.0 percent did not respond to the question.

Question 17. Does your school district allow for profit non-school use of school facilities?

A. Yes B. No

Of the 147 districts responding, 72 district or 48.3 percent allow for-profit use of facilities, 75 districts or 50.3 percent of the districts do not allow for-profit use of facilities, and 2 district or 1.7 percent did not respond to the question.

Question 18. Does your school district have a reciprocal agreement with another agency for extended use of facilities?

A. Yes B. No

Of the 148 districts responding, 30 districts or 20.1 percent have a reciprocal agreement with another agency, 118 districts or 79.2 percent do not have a

reciprocal agreement, and 1 district or .7 percent did not respond to the question.

Question 19. Does your district allow usage of the following products on school property by non-school groups?

Tobacco or Tobacco Products	A.	Yes	B.	No
Alcoholic Beverages	A.	Yes	B.	No

Of the 147 districts responding to the questions concerning tobacco or tobacco products usage on school property, 20 districts or 13.4 percent allow usage, 127 districts or 85.2 percent do not allow usage, and 2 districts or 1.3 percent did not respond to the question.

Of the 147 districts responding to the question of alcoholic beverage use by non-school groups on school property, 3 district or 2.0 percent allow alcoholic beverages, 144 districts or 96.6 percent do not allow usage, and 2 districts or 1.3 percent did not respond to the question.

Question 20. Are there facilities within your district that are not available for non-school use?

A. Yes B. No

Please list facilities that are not available to non-school groups.

a._____ d._____
b._____ e._____
c._____

Of the 145 districts responding to the question of facilities not available for non-school group use, 65 districts or 43.6 percent have facilities that were not available for use, 80 districts or 53.7 percent do not have facilities restricted for use by non-school groups, and 4 district or 2.7 percent did not respond to the question. The facilities listed as not available by the school districts are as follows:

Space	Frequency	Space	Frequency
a. office	19	m. warehouse	2
b. classrooms	16	n. storage area	1
c. gym	16	o. lawn areas	1
d. shop/vocational	12	p. typing areas	1
e. bus facilities	9	q. teachers area	1
f. computer areas	8	r. elementary building	1
g. science/ labs	8	s. high school building	1
h. cafeteria/kitchen	6	t. administration building	1
i. special classrooms	3	u. general service center	1
j. library	2	v. high school commons	1
k. main building	2	w. weight room	1
l. boiler room	1	x. drivers education room	1

Comments were solicited from the superintendents concerning district experiences in developing policies and fee structures concerning non-school use of school facilities. The comments received are listed in the order tabulated as follows:

*Use MSBA model policies, have not computerized into an integrated local policy...
*An ongoing challenge
*Profit making activities are limited to groups that can return the money
*Time and a half charged for custodial, rarely for utilities
*Well written and very helpful
*Forty per cafeteria, ten per hour for gym or ball field
*Policy needs review
*Liability requires limits to school youth and government organizations
*Every community is different
*Policies are in the board minutes, district charges ten dollars per hour for gym, lunch..
*We have had no problems
*Prior to 1992 a fee was charged, since that time organizations donate enough to cover
*School activities take first priority but have a liberal policy for other educational groups...
*We have a mess, I will try to fix it but so far little help from board or community
*District going through major changes, have charged three dollars per hour for student use
*Policies and procedures work well for our district
*Most building are available
*Fifteen dollars per hour is basic fee structure, non-profit is no charge if custodians are not used..
*We have no fee structure, only facility used is gym for volleyball and outside field..
*This is a problem, several power groups in the community set up different rules
*Rent gym and lunch room for a minimum of two hours, the cook or custodian must be present
*We have policies but policies tend not to cover every possible activity
*The more community use we have the better our community support seems
*Old policies not being combined with MSBA policies
*It is difficult to agree on a policy to cover all situations
*Our policy needs updating in light of recent court rulings, board of education is reluctant

Discussion

The results from the survey revealed that 10 districts or 6.9 percent failed to have written policies and regulations specifically designed to allow non-school group usage of school facilities. The survey revealed that 135 districts or 93.1 percent have written policies and regulations governing non-school group use of school facilities. There were 91 school districts that returned a copy of their district's facility usage policy. The returned policies and regulations were reviewed and the following components were noted as being major parts of these policies:

1. A statement of the Board of Education's philosophy regarding non-school use of facilities.
2. Types of community and/or outside organizations permitted use of school facilities.
3. Location, times, and types of facilities available for non-school use.
4. Identification of the school district employee responsible for granting facility usage permission.
5. The approved fee schedule and permit process for non-school use of facilities.
6. A hold harmless agreement with the group or certificate of insurance naming the school district as additional insurance.

7. A statement regarding responsibility of user groups for damages to school district property beyond normal wear and tear.

8. A statement concerning prohibited activities is generally included.

Policies from unidentified school districts are included in Appendix C. These policies are representative of various school district sizes (student enrollment) and geographic location within Missouri.

Summary

This chapter was devoted to presentation of the results of the study. A chi-square test was utilized to test the HO1 concerning whether a district had written policies using the variables of size, classification, membership in Missouri School Boards Association, and population status in the state. A chi-square test was also utilized to test HO2 to see if there were differences between school districts that charged for non-school usage of school facilities and those that did not charge. The school size, classification, membership in Missouri School Boards Association, and population status variables were utilized in the hypotheses testing. Question numbers

seven through 20, were presented in Table Nine indicating frequency of response and percentage of response. The areas not allowed to be utilized in school buildings by non-school groups were listed by area and frequency. Comments from school district superintendents about their experiences in developing policies and fees concerning non-school group usage were individually listed.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

Policy making is judged to be a most important function of a board of education (Knezevich, 1975). The development of a well defined policy is no simple chore. It requires discipline, considerable debate, discussion, and time. On occasion, the value of policy formulation may be questioned in view of the time and effort required. Most authorities agree that written statements of policy are essential to effective school administration. According to Knezevich (1975) policy statements should encompass all aspects of school operations that command the attention of the school board. This difficult process cannot be successfully accomplished without guidance from the professional education staff and, at times, an attorney.

After policy formulation, it becomes the responsibility of the superintendent of schools to establish provisions that implement board policies. Each staff has a responsibility thus to implement policies relating to their area of responsibility.

Boards of education, acting in their capacity as policy making bodies for their respective public school

districts, are often called upon to make decisions relating to non-educational as well as educational functions of their school systems. This study focuses on the rules and regulations adopted by boards of education in Missouri Public School Districts that govern non-school use of public school facilities.

Debates regarding how public school facilities can be efficiently used are becoming more common. It seems a waste to have school buildings, playgrounds, and equipment standing idle after school hours, on weekends, and during vacation periods. It would appear to be desirable for school district boards of education to devise plans and practices to optimize the utilization of school district facilities for the students and community alike.

Policies governing the usage of facilities by non-school groups have not undergone rigorous formulation. Little is known concerning the cost and benefits rendered with extended school facility usage beyond the traditional K-12 school day program. Little has been done to determine what facility usage policies are in effect in Missouri Public Schools. Knowledge by the school board of the needs of non-school groups within

the community for use of school facilities could serve as a point of reference for school facility usage policies for non-school groups.

There were three main purposes of this study. They were:

1. To determine the percentages of Missouri Public School Districts that allow extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.

2. To determine which school districts have written board policies in regard to extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.

3. To determine typical and average fees charged by school districts which allow extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.

The data for this study were obtained from school districts in Missouri which were originally used by Wells (1979) in his study of school policies on corporal punishment. The sample used by Wells (1979) was most recently used again by Jones (1988) for a policy study on communicable disease policies in Missouri Public Schools. The population sample used in this study consisted of 165 Missouri K-12 public school districts which are listed in Appendix E.

The superintendent of schools in each district was mailed a questionnaire concerning non-school usage of facilities. It was to be completed and returned to the researcher. The questionnaire is located in Appendix A. Policy information and fee structures concerning non-school use of facilities were also requested. The data were collected during the summer of 1993, utilizing three mailings over nine weeks. A follow-up telephone call was made to districts that had not returned information during the last mailing.

Return of 149 usable surveys resulted in a return rate of 90 percent. In addition to the survey, 91 superintendents returned copies of their district's non-school use policies and 47 school district superintendents returned copies of their fee structure related to non-school use of facilities.

The combination of the responses to the questionnaire and examination of the policies provided the data for the study. A chi-square test was utilized to determine if there were significant differences between school districts with written policies on non-school group usage of school facilities and those without such policies based on the school district

variables of school size (student enrollment), classification (AA, AAA, U, Accredited, Provisional Accreditation, Unaccredited), membership in Missouri School Boards Association, and metropolitan or outstate locations.

A chi-square test was also utilized to determine if there were significant differences between school districts which charge for non-school usage of facilities and those that do not charge based on the school district variables of school district size (student enrollment), classification (AA, AAA, U, Accredited, Provisional Accreditation, Unaccredited), membership in Missouri School Boards Association, and metropolitan or outstate location.

Specifically this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Do Missouri public schools allow extended use of public school facilities by non-school groups?
2. Do Missouri public schools have board policies that govern extended use of school facilities by non-school groups?

3. Do Missouri public schools allowing extended use of school facilities charge for such usage and, if so, what are typical rates? Do the school districts have different rates for different types of groups?
4. How often are non-school facility usage policies and rate schedules reviewed by the school district?
5. Who is the school district person most often responsible for carrying out school district policies relating to facility usage by non-school groups?
6. Do the public schools allowing extended usage of facilities execute formal contracts for such usage?
7. Does the size of the school district relate to whether or not it has a written policy?
8. Do the public school districts' fees provide reimbursement for supervision, utilities, capital outlay, security, and custodial services for extended use of facilities by non-school groups?

9. Do the public school districts restrict usage of facilities by non-school group to residents of the school district?
10. Are there facilities in the school districts that are generally not available to non-school groups?
11. Is there a minimum age for the responsible person making the application to utilize school district facilities by non-school groups?
12. Do the school districts require insurance protection naming the school district as additional insured by the parties requesting use of school facilities?
13 Do the school districts restrict the times the school facilities can be used by non-school groups?
14. Do the school districts limit commercial ventures within the school facilities by non-school groups?
15. Do the school districts require that a group requesting extended use of school facilities be organized?

16. Do the school districts have a reciprocal agreement with other public or non-profit entities for extended facility usage?
17. Do the school districts clarify conduct and responsibilities by non-school user groups?

Findings

The study provided the answers to the following research questions.

Question #1

Do Missouri Public Schools allow extended use of school facilities by non-school groups?

Of the responding districts, 98.0 percent allow non-school usage of facilities and two percent of the reporting districts did not complete this item on the questionnaire.

Question #2

Do Missouri Public Schools have board policies that govern extended use of facilities by non-school groups?

Of the responding districts, 93.1 percent have written policies concerning non-school use of facilities. The districts that did not have written policies covering non-school use of facilities

represented 6.9 percent of total responding districts and all had a student population of 1800 or fewer.

Question #3

Do Missouri Public Schools allowing extended use of school facilities charge for usage, and if so, what are typical rates?

Of the 145 districts responding to this question, 125 or 86.2 percent charge for extended use of facilities. Twenty district or 13.8 percent did not charge for non-school usage and all of these districts had a student enrollment of 1200 or fewer. A sample fee structure for various types of school facilities is located in Appendix D. The rates varied greatly throughout the state and typical rates were not discernable from the fee structures.

Question #4

Do the school districts have different rates for different types of groups?

Of the 141 districts reporting, 85 districts or 60.3 percent did not have different rates for different groups. When the district enrollment reached 2400 students, the districts were more likely to have different rates for different groups.

Question #5

How often are non-school facility usage policies and rate schedules reviewed by the school district?

One hundred and forty-six districts responded to this question and 77 districts or 52.7 percent indicate no scheduled review of facility usage policies. Forty-one districts or 28.1 percent reported a scheduled review every year. The majority of the districts with a yearly review were under 1800 student enrollment.

Question #6

Who is the school district person most often responsible for carrying out school district policies relating to non-school group usage of facilities?

Of the 146 districts reporting on this question, 83 districts or 56.8 percent indicated that the superintendent is responsible, 13 districts or 8.7 percent indicated the assistant superintendent is responsible, 7 districts or 8.7 percent indicated the director of buildings and grounds is responsible, 18 districts or 12.1 percent indicated the principal is responsible, and 25 districts or 16.8 percent listed

other as the responsible person for administering the non-school use of facility policies.

Question #7

Do school districts allowing non-school use of facilities execute formal contracts for such usage?

Of the 147 districts responding, 87 district or 59.2 percent execute formal contracts for non school use. Of the 60 districts, or 40.8 percent reporting non use of a contract, 48 districts had a student enrollment of 1200 or fewer.

Question #8

Does the size of the school district relate to whether or not it has a written policy?

Of the 145 districts responding, 135 districts or 93.1 percent have written policies covering non-school use of facilities. Ten districts or 6.9 percent responded no to the question and these districts had a student population of 1800 or fewer. The size of the district was not significant to the question of written policy.

Question #9

Do the public school district policies provide reimbursement for supervision, utilities, capital outlay, security, and custodial services for extended use of facilities by non-school groups?

Of the 149 districts responding, 108 districts or 72.5 percent charge for custodial services, 35 districts or 23.5 percent charge for supervision, 92 districts or 61.7 charge for utilities, 22 districts or 14.8 percent charged for security, and 14 districts or 9.4 percent charged for capital outlay.

Question #10

Do the public school districts restrict usage of facilities by non-school groups to residents of the school district?

Of the 144 districts responding, 75 or 52.1 percent do not require the group to be composed of district citizens. There were 51 districts with enrollments of 1200 students or fewer that required the group to be residents of the districts.

Question #11

Are there facilities in the school districts that are generally not available for non-school use?

Of the 145 responding districts, 80 districts or 55.2 percent indicated that there were no facilities restricted from use by non-school groups. But in those which do restrict usage the most often listed were office areas, specialized classrooms, shops facilities, and vocational/technical areas.

Question #12

Is there a minimum age for the responsible person making the application to utilize school district facilities by non-school groups?

Of the 149 district responding to the question, 66 district or 44.3 percent did not have an age requirement. Fifty district or 33.6 percent listed the age of 21 as the required age.

Question #13

Do the school districts require insurance protection naming the school district as additional insured by the parties requesting use of school facilities?

Of the 142 districts responding to the question, 43 districts or 28.9 percent require the group to have insurance naming the school district as additional insured.

Question #14

Do the school districts restrict the times the school facilities can be used by non-school groups?

Of the 149 school districts responding, 126 districts or 84.6 percent did not allow non-school use from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on school days. One hundred and three districts or 69.1 percent did not allow non-school usage of facilities from midnight to 7:00 a.m. The majority of the districts allowed non-school use of facilities at all other times.

Question #15

Do the school districts limit commercial ventures within the school facilities by non-school groups?

Of the 149 districts responding, 75 districts or 50.3 percent did not allow commercial use of their facilities. The school districts were split 50/50 on this question throughout all sizes of school districts within the state.

Question #16

Do the school districts require the group requesting extended use of school facilities be organized?

Of the 149 districts responding, 123 district or 82.6 percent did not require the group to be organized.

Question #17

Do the school districts have a reciprocal agreement with other public or non-profit entities for extended use of facilities?

Of the 149 districts responding to the question, 118 district or 79.7 percent did not have a reciprocal agreement with other entities for extended use of facilities.

Question #18

Do the school districts clarify conduct and responsibilities by non-school user groups?

Of the 149 school districts responding, 127 districts or 86.4 percent did not allow tobacco or tobacco products usage on school property, and 144 districts or 98.0 percent did not allow alcoholic beverage or consumption of alcoholic products on school premises. Most policies required the group to be responsible for their group's conduct and any damage to school property aside from normal wear and tear would require reimbursement by the group responsible.

Conclusions

There were three main purposes of this study. They were:

1. To determine the percentage of Missouri Public School Districts that allow extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.

2. To determine which school districts have written board policies in regard to extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.

3. To determine typical and average fees charged by school districts which allowed extended use of school facilities by non-school groups.

The following conclusions have been reached as a result of this study:

Conclusion #1

It would appear from the information provided in the study that Missouri Public School Districts have taken full advantage of the Missouri Statute (RSMO 177.011, 1992) allowing non-school use of facilities. Of the 149 districts responding to the requested information, 147 districts or 98.0 percent allowed non-school use of facilities. The majority of the districts in the study allowed non-school use as long

as the use did not interfere with the educational purpose to which the facilities are devoted.

Conclusion #2

Public school districts in Missouri have a wide variety of policies and practices for administering the use of school facilities by non-school groups. policies which are widely known and are consistently and fairly administered could prevent misuse of the facility assets held in trust by school district officials. Legally, public school districts have enjoyed a liberalization of laws regarding facility use (Landis Chapel & John Steigerwald v Center Moriches Union Free School District 1993, Fairfax Covenant Church v Fairfax County School Board 1993). The majority of the school districts, 93.1 percent, have written policies concerning the use of school facilities by non-school groups. The size and geographic location of the school districts did not appear to be relevant to the existence or non-existence of a written policy concerning facility usage by non-school groups.

Conclusion #3

Whenever tax dollars go to supplement a non-school group's use of school facilities, there can surface serious reason for concern (Shaw, 1949). It is a well-established principle of law that public monies raised for one purpose cannot be devoted to another (Nolte, 1966). The majority of the school districts, 86.2 percent, in the study charged fees for non-school use of facilities. There were significant relationships between the size (student enrollment) of the school district, membership in MSBA, classification of the school district, and whether or not it charged fees for non-school use.

Various amounts were charged for the rental of facilities. Large school districts generally charge more and have more specific rental policies than do smaller districts.

Discussion

In most cases policies cited state statutes which apply to non-school group use of school facilities. Any district permitting use of facilities by non-school groups needs to have policies and regulations administered by a designated official. This official's

job in part is to minimize conflicts and confusion, protect the district against property loss and damage, assign service and supervisory personnel, handle the accounting for use application, and collect fees. The taxpayer and the school board should hold this official responsible for guaranteeing uses of tax dollars as intended by taxpayers.

Many citizens, educators, architects, urban planners, and sociologists believe that schools operate more effectively and the educational program is more productive when closely related to and used by all people of a community. Boards of education can help achieve this mission by establishing adequate policies that address non-school use of public school facilities. Ambiguity, confusion, and trouble are avoided when policies are adopted and published. Clearly written policies which reflect thorough research, sound judgement, and careful planning can stave off the maiming accusations of uninformed critics.

REFERENCES

Akers, James T. (1984). "Good Policy Tips for Public Use of School Facilities." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National School Boards Association. Houston, Texas.

Barnard, H. (1985). School Architecture. New York: A.S. Barnes' & Co.

Becoming A Better Board Member. (1989). National School Boards Association. Alexandria, Virginia.

Bortner, Doyle M. (1966). "Educational Policy Is Public Policy." American School Board Journal, 152 (12) 62.

Carrillo, Tony S. and Israel C. Heaton. (November, 1972). "Strategies for Establishing a Community Education Program," Phi Deltan Kappan, LIV, 165-167.

Carver, John. (1991). Boards that make a difference, The Jossey-Bass Public Administration Series.

Cetron, Marvin. (1985). Schools of the Future. McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Charges and Fees for Community Recreational Facilities and Activities of Public Park, Recreation and School Systems. (1932). National Recreation Association.

Columbia Public Schools, (1992) Columbia, Missouri. Policy Manual. Board of Education Policy. KG and DFB.

Co-ordination of school and community facilities: Implications of policies. (1978). Paris, France: Programme on Educational Building, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 162 404).

Cowan, A. W. "Public use of school properties." (1965). American School Board Journal, 152 (12), 50.

Daste, Daniel Douglas. (1982). "The Use of Public School Facilities by Non-School Groups as Perceived by School Administrators, Non-School Group Leaders, and Registered Voters in New Orleans." Ed.D. diss., George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.

Davis, J.C. (1973). The Principal's Guide to Educational Facilities Design, Utilization and Management. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Delegate Handbook for the NSBA 52nd Annual Delegate Assembly. (1992). National School Boards Association. Orlando, Florida.

Dempsey, G.E., Rancic, E.T., & Steinbach, P. (1990). "Look Before You Lease." American School Board Journal, 177, 32-33.

Deselms, H. D. (1978). "A descriptive study of practices and policies for selected schools and communities with programs of shared facilities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 4675A. University Microfilms No. 7901928.

Eismann, D., Burton, N. & Woldt, A. (1976). "Schools and neighborhood research study: School building use study." Seattle: Seattle Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 133 912.)

Elam, S. M., Rose, L. C., & Gallup, A. M. (September 1992). "The 24th Annual Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa Poll Of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan. p. 48-49.

Fairfax Covenant Church v. Fairfax County School Board 811 F. Supp 1137 (Ed Va 1993).

Financing Public Elementary and Secondary School Facilities in the United States. (1969). National Educational Finance Project, Special Study No. 7. Bloomington, Indiana.

Finchum, R. N. (1967). Extended Use of School Facilities. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Garber, Lee O. and Delon, Floyd G. (1971). The Law and The Teacher in Missouri. The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.

Garbett, Michael J. (1978). "The Effect of the Community School Concept upon Planning and Utilization of Indoor Physical Education Facilities in the United States since 1970." Thesis - Brigham Young University.

Garvue, Robert. (1969). Modern Public School Finance. The MacMillan Company.

Gee, E. Gordon and Sperry, David J. (1978). Education Law and the Public Schools: A Compendium. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Grieder, C. (April, 1962). "Community Use of Schools: How? When? Who Get Keys to What?" Nation's Schools, 69: 79-83.

Hiemstra, R. (1972). The Educative Community: Linking the Community, School, and Family. Lincoln, NE: Professional Educators Publications.

Higham, C. E. Joint Occupancy: Annotated Bibliography Containing Summaries of 15 Articles and Reports. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 800.)

Hoy, Wayne K. and Miskel, Cecil G. (1978). Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. Random House.

Jones, Charles Howard. (1988). "Communicable and Chronic Infectious Disease Policies and Procedures in Missouri Public Schools." Ed.D. diss., University of Missouri-Columbia.

Kennedy, Margrit I. (1976). Building Community Schools. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Kerr, Donna H. (1976). Educational Policy: Analysis, Structure, and Justification. David McKay Company, Inc.

Keuscher, R. & Martin, G. B. (1951). "Public Use of School Buildings." The School Executive, 70(11), 30-31.

Knezevich, Stephen J. (1975). Administration of Public Education Third Edition. Harper and Row Publishers.

Knezevich, Stephen J. (May, 1954). "Inadequate School Plant Facilities." The American School Board Journal, p. 44-46.

Koller, Ronald DeJean. (1977). "The Availability and Extent of use of Public School Facilities for Community Recreation in Alabama." Ph.D. diss., University of Oregon.

Landis Chapel and John Steigerwald v. Center Moriches Union Free School District 113 S. Ct. 2141 (1993).

McClurkin, W. D. (1964). School Building Planning. The MacMillan Company.

Minzey, Jack. (November, 1972). "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," Phi Delta Kappan, LIV, 150-153.

Missouri. (1992-93). Missouri School Directory.

Missouri. (1992). The Public School Laws of Missouri.

Moore, Harold. (November, 1972). "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practice," Phi Delta Kappan, LIV, 168-170.

Nolte, M. Chester. (1966). "Courts Becoming More Liberal in Permitting Non-school Use of Public School Buildings." American School Board Journal, 152 (12), 12.

Nolte, M. Chester. (1980). Nolte's School Law Desk Book. Parker Publishing Company.

Piele, P.K., & Forsberg, J. R. (1974). "School Property: The Legality of Its Use and Disposition." NOLPE Second Monography Series on Legal Aspects of School Administration. 1974, 26 (Serial No. 5). Topeka, KS: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management No. OEC-8-080353-3514).

Planning Community School Centers (1978). (Number 2 in a series of 6 booklets). New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168-187.)

Policy Development. A Program of Continuing Education for School Board Members. National School Boards Association. Washington, D.C. 1984.

Policy for Excellence. A Program of Continuing Education for School Board Members. National School Boards Association. Alexandria, VA. 1984.

Policy is Power. A Program of Continuing Education for School Board Members. National School Boards Association. Washington, D.C. 1984.

Quinn, Terrence. (1992). How Much More Can an Elementary School Do? Principal. 71-3. 6-7.

Rand Corporation, The. (1955). A Million Random Digits with 100,000 Normal Deviates. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Rebore, Ronald W., Sr. (1984). A Handbook for School Board Members. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Reutter, E. Edmund, Jr. and Hamilton, Robert R. (1979). The Law of Public Education Second Edition Supplement. The Foundation Press, Inc.

Reutter, E. Edmund, Jr. and Hamilton, Robert R. (1970). The Law of Public Education Second Edition. The Foundation Press, Inc.

Reutter, E. Edmund, Jr. and Hamilton, Robert R. (1985). The Law of Public Education Third Edition. The Foundation Press, Inc.

Rich, John Martin. (1974). New Directions in Educational Policy. Professional Educators Publications, Inc.

School Board Policies on the Community Use of School Facilities: Educational Policies Development Kit. (1971). Waterford, CT: National School Boards Association, Educational Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 058 659)

Schools for America: American Association of School Administrators. (1967). Washington D.C.

Schwinden, Ted. (1986). "What Are Schools For?" Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 223-4.

Sender Benjamin. (1986). "You May Limit Outsiders' Access to Your Schools." American School Board Journal, 173, 27.

Shaw, A. B. Cost of building use by non-school groups. School Business Affairs, 1949, 15, 2; 7-8.

Sorenson, G.P., Lobosco, A., and Chapman, D.W. (1987). "Equal Access For Voluntary Student Prayer Groups: Public School Administrators' Knowledge and School Practice." West's Educational Law Reporter, 74, 9-17.

Surplus School Space: Options & Opportunities: A Report From Educational Facilities Laboratories. (1976). New York.

The American School Board Journal staff. (1976). "How to Make Your Policies Do What You Want Them to Do." 163, no. 9.

The Good News Sports Club v. The School District of The City of Ladue. US District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, Case #4:92 CV00113 E1F (1993)

Thompson, John Thomas. (1976). Policy Making in American Public Education. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Thompson, L.M. (May 1967). "After Hours Building Use," The American School Board Journal, 154:36-7.

Timar, T. B., & Guthrie, J. W. (1980). "Public Value and Public School Policy in the 1980s." Educational Leadership, 38 (2), 112-115.

Totten, W. Fred. (1970). The Power of Community Education. Pendell Publishing Company.

Tuttle, Edward M. (1960). School Board Leadership in America. Chicago: Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Wesaver, Donald. (November 1972). "A Case for Theory Development in Community Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 154-157.

Wells, James N. (1979). "Status and Substance of Missouri School Districts' Policies Dealing with Corporal Punishment." Ed.D. diss., University of Missouri-Columbia.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SURVEY OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REGARDING USAGE OF AND FEE CHARGE FOR NON-SCHOOL GROUP USAGE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

Terms

For the purpose of this questionnaire the following definitions should be applied:

Non-School Group

Any group which has no direct affiliation with the ongoing educational program sponsored by the public school board.

Policy

A principle adopted by the board of education to chart a course of action for its administration and to define the limits within which he will exercise judgement and discretion. The what, the why, and the how much.

School Facility

Any building, land, or related property which comes under the jurisdiction of the school board.

Part I: Background

Please indicate your response by circling the letter that precedes the correct or appropriate response to the first four questions. Be sure every item is marked.

1. What is the current enrollment of students in your entire school district?

A. Fewer than 200
B. 200-499
C. 500-799
D. 800-1199
E. 1200-1799
F. 1800-2399
G. 2400-4999
H. 5000-9999
I. 10,000-and above

2. What is the present classification of your entire school district?

A. U
B. AA
C. AAA
D. Accredited
E. Provisional Accreditation
F. Unaccredited

3. Is your school district board of education a member of the Missouri School Boards Association?

A. Yes
B. No

PART II: POLICIES

Please indicate your response by circling the letter that precedes the correct or appropriate response to the question.

4. Does your school district allow non-school use of school facilities?

A. yes B. No

5. Does your school district have written policies that govern non-school use of facilities?

A. yes B. No

6. Does your school district charge fees for non-school group usage of facilities?

A. yes B. No

7. Do the fees charged cover district expenses for the following items?

Custodial Service	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Supervisory Personnel	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Utility Cost	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Security Cost	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Capital Outlay	A. Yes	B. No	C. N/A
Other, please list:	_____		

8. Does your school district have different rates for different types of groups?

A. Yes B. No

9. How often are district policies covering extended use of school facilities by non-school groups reviewed by the board?

A. Once each year
B. Once every two years
C. Once every three years
D. Once every four years
E. Once every five years
F. No scheduled review

10. Who is the school district person responsible for administering policies regarding non-school usage of school facilities?

A. Superintendent
B. Asst. Superintendent
C. Dir. Buildings and Grounds
D. Principal
E. Head Custodian
F. Other, please list:___

11. Does your district execute a formal contract with non-school groups utilizing district facilities?

A. Yes B. No

12. Does your district require the requesting group to be organized? eg: Incorporated, Officers, By Laws.

A. Yes B. No

13. Does your district require the requesting group to have insurance protecting the school district?

A. Yes B. No

14. Does your district have a minimum age requirement for the person signing or requesting the usage of school facilities?

A. Yes B. No If yes, the minimum age is_____?

15. Does your school district restrict non-school group usage of facilities to residents of the school district?

A. Yes B. No

16. Does your district allow non-school groups usage of facilities during the following times? (Please answer each item)

7:00a.m.-4:00p.m. school days	A. Yes	B. No
7:00a.m.- 4:00p.m. Non school work days	A. Yes	B. No
4:00 p.m.-Midnight	A. Yes	B. No
Legal Holidays	A. Yes	B. No
Midnight - 7:00 a.m.	A. Yes	B. No
Saturday 7:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	A. Yes	B. No
Sunday 7:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	A. Yes	B. No
Sunday 12:01 p.m. - Midnight	A. Yes	B. No

17. Does your school district allow for profit non-school use of school facilities?

A. Yes B. No

18. Does your school district have a reciprocal agreement with another agency for extended use of facilities?

A. Yes B. No

19. Does your district allow usage of tobacco or tobacco products on school property by non-school groups?

A. Yes B. No

Does your district allow alcohol use by non-school groups?

A. Yes B. No

20. Are there facilities within your district that are not available for non-school use?

A. Yes B. No

Please list facilities that are not available to non-school groups.

a._____ d_____

b._____ e_____

c_____ f_____

Please send a copy of your district's written policies and fee structure for non-school usage of school facilities, when you return this questionnaire, in the stamped, self addressed envelope.

Comments about your district's experiences in developing policies and fee structures concerning non-school use of school facilities:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your time, effort, and cooperation.

APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATIONS

College of Education

Department of Educational Administration

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65211
Telephone (314) 882-8221
FAX [314] 882-5071

July 16, 1993

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a study of the policies and fees charged for non-school group usage of public school facilities in Missouri. This study is related to my work toward a doctoral degree at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Boards of education, acting in their capacity as policy making bodies for their respective public school districts, are often called upon to make decisions relating to non-educational as well as educational functions of their school systems. I am interested in identifying the common elements found in Missouri School District Policies related to non-school usage of facilities.

Your assistance is requested with the study by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Secondly, would you please enclose a copy of your district's written policy and fee structure for non-school usage of your district facilities. The common elements of policies concerning non-school use of facilities will be identified in Missouri Public K-12 School Districts. Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of this material.

You may be assured that your school district and policy will not be identified individually in any way after it is received. No evaluation, judgement, or rating of the policy or fee structure of any school will occur.

When the study is completed the findings will be available without reference to an individual or district. If you have a particular need or interest for this information, please indicate your interest and an abstract of the study will be sent to you.

I believe that this study will be of value as a resource to Missouri superintendents and boards working with policies and fees related to non-school group usage of public school facilities. Thank you for your cooperation.

by:

R. G. Kirby, Principal Investigator
Dir. of Bldgs. & Grounds
5911 Blue Ridge Blvd.
Raytown, MO 64133

Dr. Robert Shaw
Dissertation Supervisor
207 Hill Hall UMC
Columbia, MO 65201

an equal opportunity institution

College of Education

Department of Educational Administration

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65211
Telephone (314) 882-8221
FAX [314] 882-5071

August 6, 1993

Dear Colleague:

Approximately three weeks ago a letter and questionnaire regarding non-school group usage and fee structure of public school facilities was mailed to you. As of this date, your reply has not been received. Perhaps the mail delivery failed or perhaps you were very busy and put it aside to be filled out later. I can understand and appreciate your busy schedule, since I am an administrator also.

However, it is very important that a high percentage of the surveys be included in the study because it is a random sample and a high response is necessary to make this study more valid. I believe the results of this policy study will be a benefit to the schools in Missouri.

A copy of the first letter and questionnaire is enclosed with a stamped, self-addressed envelope, in case the mail did not get to you the first time. Please, may I ask for your cooperation in filling out the enclosed questionnaire and send me your policy and fee structure for non-school group usage of your facilities.

Thanks for your cooperation and help.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Kirby
Principal Investigator
5911 Blue Ridge Blvd.
Raytown, MO 64133

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE POLICIES

FACILITY USE POLICY SCHOOL #1

Community Use of School Facilities

It is the belief and intent of the Board of Education that school facilities should be made available for as many community uses as are not inconsistent with carrying on the school's primary function--that of educating the children of the district.

With this philosophy in mind and in order that the vast and varied uses of school facilities may be effectively and equitably administered, certain school facilities will be available to groups on a "first come, first served" basis provided these facilities are not needed by public school groups, public school affiliated groups or student-related groups, and provided also, in the judgment of the school district officials, the intended use is of a nature generally acceptable to the community and is not damaging to the building or its contents.

In the interest of health and safety in an attempt to cooperate with other local organizations and in order to assure that facilities and equipment will be ready for use for the regular school purposes, the following policies governing the use of school facilities and equipment are established.

BUILDING AND EQUIPMENT USE

No organization shall be eligible to use school facilities if such organization (a) advocates any doctrine or theory subversive to the laws or the Constitution of the United States or the laws or Constitution of the State of Missouri; (b) advocates social or political change by violence or overthrow of state or federal government; (c) discriminates as to its membership because of race or color; (d) discriminates as to those who may participate in its use of the school facilities because of race or color; nor are school facilities available to any individual or group supporting individuals or groups advocating subversion, violence or racial discrimination.

Any group using school facilities is responsible for all damage to school property beyond that occasioned by normal use.

The Board of Education, through the assistant superintendent for business, reserves the right to suggest alternate places for any function or activity if, in the opinion of the assistant superintendent for business, such transfer is in the best interest of the school district.

Arrangements for the use of school facilities by groups other than public school, public-school-affiliated and student-related groups (before 5 p.m.) must be made in the office of the assistant superintendent for business. Requests for the use of school facilities must be made during the hours the business office is open, and thirty-six (36) hours in advance of the date and time the facilities are to be used. Earlier requests enhance approval, since all community use permits are on a "first come, first served" basis.

A written permit will be issued for the use of school property in triplicate--one copy each to the building principal, the applicant, and school district business office. Each permit is subject to cancellation if the facilities are later found by the school principal to be needed for school or school-affiliated purposes. The privilege of cancellation, however, shall be used only where necessary, and always with regard to the desire of the Board of Education to allow the fullest use of school facilities by the citizens of the community. Such permits which are considered to be part of this policy may be granted for a single use or a limited continuing use.

No permit shall be issued except upon satisfactory assurance that the use of the school facilities will be under the direct supervision of an adult who is resident of this school district, and who is judged to be responsible and to be competent to supervise the proposed program of activities.

A regularly employed member of the custodial staff, and/or the building principal or assistant principal must be on duty during the use of any school building

by groups to which a permit has been issued. All permits will be issued for specific rooms. It shall be the responsibility of the permit holder to restrict the activities of his or her group to that specific area except for necessary hallways and restrooms.

Categories of users are defined by, but not limited to the examples included:

Public School Groups

Regularly scheduled classes which meet regularly and are considered a part of the school's curriculum; school-sponsored activities such as school athletic and music groups, student clubs and plays, student council activities, student social organizations, and other similar school sponsored groups;

School Affiliated Groups

School affiliated groups such as parent-teacher associations, school-approved student groups, parent organizations, employee groups of an educational, professional and social nature, and other similar school-affiliated groups;

Student Related Groups

Community youth character building groups such as Boy Scouts, Club Scouts, Brownies, Bluebirds, YMCA, YWCA, Campfire Girls, Latchkey, Junior Achievement clubs, 4-H clubs, and other youth character building groups of a similar nature, including municipally sponsored youth recreation programs.

Community Groups

Community educational and cultural activities, such as lectures, concerts, plays, operas, recitals, pageants, talent shows, non-commercial exhibits, forums, operettas, dance presentations, natural science classes, motion picture and television programs, non-public educational classes, and other groups of a similar nature which do not culminate in personal or private gain.

Municipally sponsored adult recreational groups and activities, such as athletic groups and teams, physical education groups, art classes, and other adult groups and activities sponsored by municipalities.

Community recreational and avocational groups such as athletic groups and teams, physical education groups, dance clubs or groups, social clubs, hobby groups, non-school choral groups and other community recreational and avocational groups and activities.

Civic groups, such as Chamber of Commerce, Junior Chamber of Commerce, Service clubs, Women's clubs, League of Women Voters, and other similar civic groups.

Fraternal groups such as Elks, Moose, W.O.W, Masonic affiliated groups, I.O.O.F. and affiliated groups, fraternities, sororities, Knights of Columbus and affiliated groups, American Legion, V.F.W., non-religious church meetings and bazaars, and similar fraternal groups.

Political groups, such as Democrats and Republicans.

Charity groups, such as Good Will, Salvation Army, CARE, United Fund, Red Cross, and other similar charity groups.

Professional groups, such as labor unions, medical groups, dental groups, osteopathic groups, engineering groups and organizations, optometrists; veterinary associations, and similar professional groups.

Governmental groups, such as various branches and subsidiary groups of the City, County, State, and Federal governments, and similar governmental groups.

University and College Groups

Higher education classes, student groups such as government, fraternities, sororities, or other similar groups.

Commercial Groups

Organizations and corporations, such as businesses, firms, companies, and other groups and organizations of a private or personal nature whose primary purpose is one of promotion, financial or capital gain.

Private Groups

Private groups, personal and private functions whose primary purpose is of a promotional, social, recreational, personal nature or for private gains.

Religious Groups

Religious groups consisting of all churches and other religious groups and organizations whose primary purpose is the teaching or practicing of a religious doctrine.

PERMIT AND COST

Public School and School Affiliated Groups

Permit - None required if using building to which they are affiliated. Arrangements to be made with building principal.
Cost - None if using building with which they are affiliated. Supervisory charges for computer use will be made.

Student Related Groups

Permit - Yes, if after 5 p.m.
Before 5 p.m. arrangements are to be made with building principal.
Cost - No charge for building, custodial charge will be made. Supervisory charges for computer use will be made.

Community Groups

Permit - Yes
Cost - Nominal charge to cover building cost to school district. Custodial charge will be made.

University and College Student Groups

Permit - Yes
Cost - Scheduled building charge will be charged.

Custodial charge will be made. Supervisory charge for computer use will be made.

Commercial and Private Uses

Commercial and private uses of school facilities such as sales, private parties, demonstrations, or exhibits, culminating in personal and/or private gain, and all other educational, cultural recreational and/or avocational group activities culminating in personal and/or private gain will not be granted except on rare occasions when in the judgment of the superintendent or the Board of Education, the benefits to the community as a whole appear to justify such use.

TIME OF USAGE

School and Affiliated Groups - At discretion of building principal.
Student Related Groups - Before 5 p.m. at discretion of the building principal.
All Other Groups - Permit required.

SCHOOL EQUIPMENT

The use of school equipment, except for that equipment which is normally considered a part of the facility, will be permitted only when, in the judgement of the building principal or assistant superintendent for business, such use is justified. Examples of used that might, on occasion, be justified are: (a) stage scenery and flats which can be used without alteration; (b) audio-visual equipment; (c) special stage lighting and dimming equipment; (d) equipment on which a reciprocal arrangement is made with a community groups; and (e) use of equipment by a staff member for professional uses. All equipment requiring an operator must be operated by school or school-approved personnel.

COMPUTER EQUIPMENT

Public school groups, school-affiliated groups, university and college student groups, and student-related groups may use the computer hardware and/or computer labs, providing a media-specialist or other approved school employee, acting in a supervisory capacity, is present. Supervisors required to be on duty under this policy shall be paid. A supervisory fee shall be charged to each group. All other groups wishing to use computer equipment must negotiate a contract for that use with the assistant superintendent for business.

Public school groups and school-affiliated groups may use district-owned software. All other groups must provide their own software which follows other requirements of this policy. All software used on district computers must be in compliance with copyright laws. No computer hardware will be used to illegally duplicate any copyrighted software.

District staff members may use the computer hardware, software and lab facilities, for their professional growth by seeking the approval of the building principal when the use is outside the school day.

CAFETERIA KITCHEN

Cafeteria kitchens may be used, providing the school cafeteria manager or other designated cafeteria employee, acting in a supervisory capacity, is present, and providing all persons working in the kitchen (preparing food an/or handling kitchen equipment) meet the requirement for school food handlers. Cafeteria employees required to be on duty under this policy shall be paid by the group using the facility.

SUNDAY USE

Sunday use of school facilities will not be permitted except on rare occasions which, when granted, will require the approval of the assistant superintendent for business upon the recommendation of the building principal.

USE AFTER 11 P.M.

As a general practice all building uses will terminate by or before 11 p.m. to allow time for the operation staff to clean the facilities. Any extension of time for extenuating circumstance must be approved by the assistant superintendent for business, who will also determine the amount of additional charges required.

FACILITY USE POLICY SCHOOL #2

As a service to the community and in accordance with state law, the Board of Education may allow the use of public school facilities by individuals, groups, and associations for educational, recreational, social, civic, philanthropic and other similar purposes as the Board deems are for the best interests of the community. Permission to use school facilities will be granted to community organizations and residents by the superintendent, or his or her designee, in keeping with the policies, rules and regulations adopted by the Board. However, such use will be interfere in any way with the regular programs and activities of the school district.

A nominal rental fee to cover operational costs (heat, lights, etc.) and custodial service will be charged in accordance with a schedule recommended by the superintendent and approved by the Board. The fee will not be charged to any school-related organization. The Board may consider waiving the fee for special public programs.

The use of playgrounds and buildings during the summer months for recreational purposes shall be governed by the superintendent according to the Board policies, rules, and regulations.

Where possible, a certificate of insurance or hold-harmless agreement shall be provided by the persons or organizations using school facilities.

Any civic group or nonprofit organization in the community wishing to use the building shall meet the following requirements:

1. The group must be an organized one with sufficient financial standing to assume responsibility for any possible damage that might be done to the property.

2. Application must be made by the group to the superintendent for a date satisfactory to the requirements of the school program.

3. The organization must have entered into an agreement to pay the custodial fee and to assume responsibility for any damage that may be done to the project, plus other charges that may be levied by the Board of Education.

4. Use of the school buildings, on Sunday, shall be limited to those individuals who have regular duties to perform, and non-school groups. Students properly supervised by a teacher or other approved adult, may have use of the gym on Sunday afternoons from 2:00 to 5:00 p.m., with the approval of the building principal or superintendent.

5. District students have priority in using building.

6. No organization shall be granted the right to use the facilities without volunteer school personnel being present or paid custodial help. Al volunteer school personnel must be approved by building principal and will be responsible for cleaning of the building.

7. No organization shall be allowed to use school facilities for fund-raising activities when an admission is charged; unless all net proceeds are utilized for students' benefit.

Use of School Building for Private Lessons

Members of the school staff who desire the use of school buildings for private lessons or for tutoring for which they will receive pay directly from students, or their parents, are requested to secure approval in writing from the superintendent of schools.

FACILITY USE POLICY SCHOOL #3

COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

As a service to the community and in accordance with state law, the Board of Education may allow the use of public school facilities by individuals, groups and associations for educational, recreational, social, civic, philanthropic, and other similar purposes as the Board deems are for the best interests of the community.

Permission to use school facilities will be granted to community organizations and residents by the superintendent, or his or her designee, in keeping with the policies, rules and regulations adopted by the Board. However, such use will not interfere in any way with the regular programs and activities of the school district.

The use of playgrounds and buildings during the summer months for recreation purposes shall be governed by the superintendent according to the Board policies, rules and regulations.

Where possible, a certificate of insurance or hold-harmless agreement shall be provided by the persons or organizations using school facilities.

Fees

A nominal rental fee to cover operational costs (heat, lights, etc.) and custodial service will be charged in accordance with a schedule recommended by the superintendent and approved by the Board. The fee will not be charged by any school-related organization. The Board may consider waiving the fee for special public programs.

The Board shall approve an established fee or rental schedule for the use of school facilities. Such fees shall be consistent from school to school and based upon the actual cost of operation and custodial care.

Rental fees may be waived for small groups using school facilities at times when they are normally opened and

if, in the judgment of the administrator, no special custodial service is needed for either supervision or safety. Rental fees for the use of school facilities will be reviewed on a regular basis.

A schedule of charges for the use of school facilities, including building application forms, will be available in the principal's office.

Conditions of Use

Application forms developed and/or approved by the superintendent must be approved by the appropriate administrator prior to contracting for the use of school facility by non-school organizations or groups. Such applications shall protect the Board against any claims or liabilities. They shall also protect the buildings and equipment against undue use or damage, making the user responsible for any and all damage.

Authorized groups using school equipment within the school shall be responsible for same. In exceptional cases, approved by the appropriate administrator, where school equipment is requested for use outside the school, it shall be approved only for educational or civic club purposes where all the protection afforded the Board under the regular application form shall apply.

1. Organizations wishing to use school facilities should complete the form "Application for Use of School Buildings or Grounds by Community" which can be obtained from the principal's office.
2. The principal should refer any questions that he or she cannot answer to the superintendent.

Procedures for Requesting Use of School Facilities

1. All requests for building use shall be made through the building principal's office, in order to clear the building calendar.
2. Application for building use should be made at the beginning of the school year, or no less than two week prior to the desired date of use.
3. Approval by building principal

a. Approval of the application by the building principal certifies availability of the facility for use at the desire time, and reserves the date for the applicant.
b. If approved by the building principal, applications requiring a fee for use of facilities shall be forwarded to the assistant superintendent for personnel and support services, who shall assign the appropriate fee from the established fee schedule.
c. Routine building use permits require only the approval of the building principal, as no fee is involved.

4. Applications for building use for the next school year will not be acted upon prior to September 15th, or until such later time as the calendar activities for that school has been established.

Use of School Facilities - Elections

Elections may be conducted on school facilities provided that the district has entered into a contract with the Board of Election Commissioners of the county for the rental of space in school buildings to assist the Board of Election Commissioners in the conduct of public elections in the county. The board shall be authorized to accept as a rental the customary rental paid for such polling places. Electioneering or campaigning for public office shall be prohibited upon the school premises or within school buildings at any time except when said school premises or school buildings shall be used as polling places, at which time electioneering shall be permitted to the limited extent that it is authorized under the applicable laws of the State of Missouri regarding the conduct of elections and the voting thereon.

General Guidelines

1. The person whose signature appears on the application will be held responsible for fulfilling the terms of the contract, and must be a citizen of the school district.
2. The Board shall not surrender its control of school property, and shall have the right to

countermand the use of any school premises at any time if it decides it is in the best interest of the district. Use of school premises shall not be granted if it interferes with school-sponsored activities.

3. No apparatus or equipment shall be brought into the school buildings except upon written permission of the superintendent or designee.
4. Buildings will be closed on school holidays such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Washington's Birthday and Easter vacation.
5. When the superintendent has declared the schools "closed" because of inclement weather, the buildings will be closed.
6. In case of an emergency, the superintendent reserves the right to cancel, at his or her discretion, any scheduled activity of a non-school group. Such cancellation shall be made as early as possible so that all persons involved can be notified.
7. The use of alcoholic beverages, profane language, or gambling in any form is not permitted in school buildings. Smoking within the building is only permitted in designated areas.

Priority Guidelines for Use of Facilities

Facilities shall be made available to all eligible groups on a priority basis.

1. Student activities at the school where the students currently attend have first priority when determining the availability of facilities in any school for use by groups.

    a. Student activities of other district schools

    b. All other district organizations:

        1) Board of Education

        2) Adult Evening School

        3) Summer school

4) PTA's and any other organization which has a direct connection with the district may use the buildings for such meetings as are appropriate at no cost, with the possible exception of a custodial fee which could be charged if the school is not ordinarily open.

2. All non-school organizations located within the school district, and other organizations with membership of more than 50% school district residents.

a. Little theater groups

b. Scouting and Camp Fire Girls

c. Resident parent/patron-sponsored children, youth and adult groups

d. Religious groups

e. No admission charge

Civic clubs, charitable and character-building organizations and other organized groups conducting meetings devoted to community interest or child welfare, and for which no admission is charged may use school buildings upon the payment of the costs of lights, heat and required custodial time. The cost of heat and light shall be determined annually by the Board.

f. Events for which admission is charged and other organizations

Groups wishing to use school facilities for events for which admission is charged, and all other civic, fraternal, religious and political groups, service organizations, and other similar groups may use school buildings upon the payment of fees to be approved by the Board and the cost of the required custodial time.

Regulations, Charges, Deposits for Use and Supervision

1. Auditorium

   a. No food or drinks will be allowed in the auditorium

   b. No smoking

   c. Crowds are not to be greater than the number of seat available (no standing room only).

   d. No building will be opened for community use without school custodians being present to open the door, care for the building and clean.

2. Cafeteria areas and high school commons

   a. Regulations

      1) Food must be served and eaten only in the cafeteria. Beverages are not to be served in any other area of the building except in the concession area serving the gym.

      2) District cafeteria personnel must be employed if kitchen facilities are required.

   b. Charges and deposits

      Same as "Auditorium" above

   c. Supervision

      Due to the nature of the area, it is important that good supervision be required. The district reserves the right to request additional district supervision at the rate approved by the Board.

      1) Approved activities

         a) Dinner meeting

b) Meeting with refreshments
c) Teas, etc.

3. Rooms used for meetings:

a. Rooms not available for meetings: Laboratories, shop rooms, business machine rooms, and any other rooms with special equipment are not available to outside organizations.

b. Deposits and charges:

There is no deposit or charges for the use of rooms in a building.

c. Supervision

Group using the rooms must take full responsibility for the behavior of the people attending their meeting.

d. Approved activities

Meetings of clubs, organizations, etc.

4. Pool area

Due to the special nature of this area, a complete set of guidelines approved by the Board of Education have been established and are part of the district's operation procedures at this time. These guidelines are available in the high school principal's office or the office of the assistant superintendent for personnel and support services.

5. Equipment use:

a. Equipment use by organizations

Organizations using school facilities may request the use of certain audio-visual equipment in conjunction with the use of the facilities.

b. Restrictions on use of equipment by organizations.

1) Equipment which required a knowledge of operating procedures, such as movie projectors, must be operated by a trained operator. It is the responsibility of the organization to have someone trained to operate the equipment prior to its use.

2) The organization using the equipment shall be responsible for any damage to that equipment. (Replacement of AV bulbs and routine maintenance servicing is not chargeable to an organization.)

3) School instructional equipment is not for rent.

4) School instructional equipment may not be taken off school premises.

c. Stage equipment: See 1-d above

1) East - 484 seats

2) West - 514 seats

3) Central - 736 seats

6. Charges and deposits:

a. If stage lights, control room lights, microphones or other special equipment requiring the use of the control room is used, the school will furnish its own technical supervisor to operate the equipment, at the rate specified on the fee schedule. This fee shall be charged to the group making the request.

A fee schedule is available in the principal's office or the office of the assistant superintendent for personnel and support services.

b. Other fees assessed shall be sufficient to cover all additional costs to the district, including but not limited to custodial wages, utility costs, and any required security services.

1) Fees shall be paid in advance, and shall be in addition to the deposit.

2) The applicant shall enter into a contractual agreement with the district.

c. Deposits: A $50 cash deposit will be required to be used against any damages to property and equipment.

1) The building principal or his or her designee and a representative of the group using the facility shall inspect the facility(ies) to be used by the group before the activity and the morning after its use, and assess any damage to the facility(ies) at that time.

2) If the damage cost exceeds the amount of deposit, the applicant will be billed for the balance.

3) If the damage cost is less than the deposit, the balance of the deposit will be returned.

4) If there is no damage, the full deposit will be returned.

7. Supervision

a. The district reserves the right to require one or more supervisors or uniform police of the district's choice be employed, if the situation and the numbers of people involved make it necessary in the judgment of the superintendent or his or her designee. Each supervisor or police officer will be paid at the regular hourly rate. The minimum police

rate is currently $20.00 per evening, but may be revised annually with the approval of the Board of Education.

FACILITY USE POLICY SCHOOL #4

COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

As a service to the community and in accordance with state law, the Board of Education may allow the use of public school facilities by individuals, groups and association for educational, recreational, social, civic, philanthropic, and other similar purposes as the Board deems are for the best interests of the community.

Permission to use school facilities will be granted to community organizations and residents by the superintendent, or his or her designee, in keeping with the policies, rules and regulations adopted by the Board. However, such use will not interfere in any way with the regular programs and activities of the school district.

A nominal rental fee to cover operational costs (heat, lights, etc.) and custodial service will be charged in accordance with a schedule recommended by the superintendent and approved by the Board. The fee will not be charged to any school-related organization. The Board may consider waiving the fee for special public programs.

Where possible, a certificate of insurance or hold-harmless agreement shall be provided by the persons or organizations using school facilities.

No groups will be issued a permit to operate a "for profit" activity or one resulting in commercial use.

The priority of assigning building space will be as follows:

1. School activities, curricular and extracurricular.

2. Parent-school organizations regular business meetings and officially designated activities.

3. Boy Scouts' and Girl Scouts' regular meetings and officially designated activities, YMCA, church groups, and athletic association programs (the participants being children).

4. Civic groups (philanthropic), and adult participation from the organizations listed above.

The Board reserves the right to issue permits when the use is determined to be in the community interest. Only those holding a valid permit will be allowed the use of the school buildings.

COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

School buildings in the school district shall not be used without a permit signed by the issuing officer. All permits must be in conformity with the following rules:

1. All permits shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Education and subject to a cancellation by the issuing officer or the Board of Education for a breach of any of the rules or for any good reasons. "Good reasons" shall be determined by the Board of Education.

2. A fee is required of organizations or groups to defray cost of expenses for light, heat, and custodial services.

The above fees must be paid to the school district, or checks made payable to the Treasurer of the school district.

The Board of Education shall at no time, nor for any purpose, surrender its control of the school property. Use of the school buildings shall not be granted if it will interfere with the ordinary school purposes of the building.

The organization to which this permit is granted guarantees to the Board of Education that it will be

responsible for the premises, for the orderly conduct of meetings, for the prevention of the use of alcoholic beverages in the building and on the school grounds, and for the prevention of the use of tobacco in the school buildings.

School facilities shall not be used by any group at any time to engage in activities involving gambling.

Use of building apparatus or equipment shall not be granted unless an instructor or attendant, approved by the superintendent, or his or her designee, shall be in charge of the building, rooms, or equipment. The wages of the attendant for any additional hours worked will be paid by the organization or group.

Chaperons, attendant, scoutmasters, etc., shall remain in the building until all persons except the custodians have left.

Principals are directed to report any damage or evidence of misuse of facilities following a group's use of the building. The Board of Education reserves the privilege of countermanding the use of any school premises at any time for school activities or organizations, or if it decides such action is in the best interest of the school.

Organizations or groups using buildings shall report when no longer using the building.

School facilities are to be closed to all except school employees at the hour of twelve midnight, and all day Sunday unless special permission has been granted.

COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

As a service to the community and in accordance with state law, the Board of Education may allow the use of public school facilities by individuals, groups, and associations for educational, recreational, social, civic, philanthropic, and other similar purposes as the Board deems are for the best interests of the community.

Permission to use school facilities will be granted to community organizations and residents by the superintendent, or his or her designee, in keeping with the policies, rules, and regulations adopted by the Board. However, such use will not interfere in any way with the regular programs and activities of the school district.

A nominal rental fee to cover operational costs (heat, light,etc.) and custodial service will be charged in accordance with a schedule recommended by the superintendent and approved by the Board. The fee will not be charged to any school-related organization. The Board may consider waiving the fee for special public programs.

The use of playgrounds and buildings during the summer months for recreational purposes shall be governed by the superintendent according to the Board policies, rules, and regulations.

Where possible, a certificate of insurance or hold-harmless agreement shall be provided by the persons or organizations using school facilities.

COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

The following regulations have been established to govern the use of school facilities by non-school groups.

1. Written applicant for a permit to use school facilities shall be made with the superintendent or designee for a date satisfactory to the requirements of the school program.

2. The superintendent or designee will be responsible for maintaining an accurate calendar of all uses of school facilities by school and community groups.

3. The Board shall have final authority interpreting Board policy, and in settling disputes regarding the eligibility of a non-school group's use of district facilities.

4. A majority of an organization's member must be residents of the school district before the organization's application for use of school facilities will be considered.

5. The signing of an application for use of school facilities shall be interpreted as a guarantee to the district that the organization will be responsible for the proper use of the premises, for proper adult supervision, for orderly conduct of the meetings held under its control and for prompt payment to the district to cover any damage to school property resulting from the organization's use of the facility.

6. The person whose signature appears on the application will be held responsible for fulfilling the terms of the contract, and must be a citizen of the school district.

7. The Board shall not surrender its control of school property, and shall have the right to countermand the use of any school premises at any time if it decides it is in the best interest of the district. Use of school premises shall not be granted if it interferes with school-sponsored activities.

8. Any service club may have the use of the school building and charge admission, when the money obtained is to be used for school or community improvement.

9. Organizations desiring to serve meals must receive special permission from the superintendent or designee.

10. When school cafeterias are used, a cafeteria employee shall be appointed to supervise the use of equipment.

11. No apparatus or equipment shall be brought into the school buildings except upon written permission of the superintendent or designee.

12. Use of school equipment shall not be granted unless approval is received from the building principal and such equipment is properly supervised by an employee of the district, if deemed necessary by the building principal.

13. Buildings will be closed on school holidays such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Washington's birthday and Easter vacation.

14. When the superintendent has declared the schools "closed" because of inclement weather, the buildings will be closed.

15. The superintendent or designee shall have the authority to approved routine applications. If, in the superintendents' opinion, an application calls for the use of the building for extraordinary purposes, the application shall be referred to the Board of Education. "Extraordinary purposes" shall include such programs or activities beyond the routine activities that have by custom and practice become acceptable to the Board.

16. In case of an emergency, the superintendent reserves the right to cancel, at his or her discretion, any scheduled activity of a non-school group. Such cancellation shall be made as early as possible so that all persons involved can be notified.

17. The use of alcoholic beverages, profane language or gambling in any form is not permitted in school buildings. Smoking within the building is only permitted in designated areas.

18. A fee shall be collected from non-school individuals and organizations to pay for operational and custodial services.

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT FEE SCHEDULES

SCHOOL DISTRICT #ONE

Building Use Fee Schedule

7.22-4 Rental of school buildings
In order that the public school plant may serve more extensive community use, the board of education grants the use of auditoriums, gymnasiums, playing fields, some classrooms, etc. to responsible adult associations for lectures, entertainment, or other recreational or educational activities deemed proper by the board. When the public school property is used by any group or organization, it is the policy of the board of education to make such charge as will compensate the school district for such use. The amount of the charge is based upon the facility used, the character, and extent of the program, the extent of public interest and community advantages arising for such use.

All persons, groups, organization or associations desiring to use school building facilities are required to enter into a written "Rental Contract" with the board of education, regardless of whether it be a rental for charge or a rental with no charge. Such "Rental Contract" forms shall be provided by the board of education, approved by the superintendent of schools or his authorized assistant, and be on file in the central administrative office. Unusual or questionable requests may be referred to the board for final approval or rejection.

7.22-4-a Rules Governing Usage

7.22-4-a(1) All rental charges must be paid no later than two (2) days in advance of performance or usage.

7.22-4-a(2) The person and/or group or organization renting the school facility is held responsible for proper supervision of participants and spectators at all times and for enforcing the rules of the contract.

7.22-4-a(3) The sale of tobacco, intoxicants or illegal drugs is prohibited in or on school property. Consumption of intoxicants or illegal drugs is

prohibited in or on school property. Use of tobacco products is prohibited in all buildings.

7.22-4-a(4) The board of education reserves the right, in all cases, to deny the rental or use of school property to individuals, groups, organization or associations for reasons the board believes to be proper and just.

7.22-4-b Rental Classification Guide
The following classifications will be used to guide the board of education in setting up rental contracts:

7.22-4-b(1) When the facility is being rented for educational purposed or for civic or community improvement in types of programs which necessitate limited

7.22-4-b(1) When the facility is being rented for educational purposes or for civic or community improvement in types of programs which necessitate limited use of the facility and equipment (lecture, film, etc.).

7.22-4-b(2) When the facility is being rented by civic groups, churches, or other non-profit organizations for the purpose of raising fund to finance new or continuing civic and/or community projects in types of programs which necessitate limited use of the facility and equipment and when no outside producing agent or agency is involved.

7.22-4-b(3) When the facility is being rented by civic groups, churches, or other non-profit organizations for the purpose of raising funds to finance new or continuing civic and/or community projects in types of programs which necessitate full use of the facility and equipment and when no outside producing agent or agency is involved.

7.22-4-b(4) Same as Sections 7.22-4-b(2) and 7.22-4-b(3) above, except that an outside producing agent or agency is involved.

7.22-4-b(5) When the facility is being rented by an individual, individuals, or any organization or

enterprise for the purpose of making a profit where such profit is returned to the individual, individuals, organization or enterprise without being designated for specific acceptable civic and/or community improvements.

Rental Rates

Auditoriums

Building	7.22-4-b(1)*		7.22-4-b(2)*		7.22-4-b(3)*	
	No ADM Charge**	ADM Charge**	No ADM Charge**	ADM Charge**	No ADM Charge**	ADM Charge**
Senior High	$30	$42	$54	$66	$78	$90
Junior High	30	42	54	66	78	90
Ele School	24	30	36	42	48	54

Gymnasiums

Sr. Hi.	168	192	216	240	264	288
Sr. Hi.old	24	36	48	60	72	84
Jr. Hi	42	54	66	78	90	102
Ele School	18	24	30	36	42	48

Stadium or Playing Fields

Sr. Hi.	30	42	54	66	78	90
Jr. Hi.	12	18	24	30	36	42
Ele School	12	18	24	30	36	42

Auditoriums

Building	7.22-4-b(4)*		7.22-4-b(5)*	Rehearsal Charge
	No ADM Charge**	ADM Charge**	ADM Charge**	
Senior High	$102	$114	$126	$30
Junior High	102	114	126	30
Ele School	60	66	72	24

Gymnasiums

Sr. Hi.	312	336	372	72
Sr. Hi. Old	96	108	120	36
Jr. Hi.	114	126	138	42
Ele School	54	60	66	18

---

*Refer to rental classification code on preceding page.

**Admission charge is construed to include donations and free will offerings.

Note: The rental charge for a matinee performance, set up especially for school pupils where reduce prices are established for these pupils, will be reduced by the same percentage as the admission price reduction.

Note: Actual personnel charges are in addition to the rates on all events.

FEE STRUCTURE SCHOOL DISTRICT #2

FILE KG-R

Use of School Facilities

1. Rental fees shall be established according to the following classification of uses by individuals or groups. The superintendent shall classify other groups and set fees for special uses not included in this classification.

2. In addition to the established rental fee, a basic charge of $7.50 per hour for custodial service shall apply during non school hours, or when extra custodial assistance is required.

3. A special charge of $20.00 per session will be charged when use of special lighting in the Little Theater is required.

Private Organizations	Semi-Private	Community
Individuals	Chamber of Commerce	Church groups
Commercial firms	Jr. Chamber of Commerce	Scouts
Political Groups	Service clubs	4-H clubs
	Music/Dance recital	
	Basketball teams	
	Fraternal groups	
	Employees	

Rental Fee Schedule

	Private	Semi-Private	Community

High School:			
Auditorium	$25.00	$15.00	No Charge
Gymnasium	25.00	15.00	
Cafeteria	25.00	15.00	
Classroom	10.00	5.00	
Elementary School:			
Gymnasium	15.00	7.00	
Classroom	10.00	5.00	

FEE STRUCTURE SCHOOL #THREE

1003.5 RENTAL FEES

Rental fees shall be charged for the use of school grounds, buildings, and equipment as established by the following schedule. In addition to the rental fee, a charge of $5.00 per hour will apply to the use of school buildings for activities for which a custodian is needed or extra clean-up is required. All fees are payable at the time a rental agreement is completed. The superintendent of schools is authorized to compute fees on an hourly basis, or waive fees for a civic or community group for activities that would benefit the school. A deposit may be required to insure the return of equipment that is removed from school premises. Fees are for one day or one time use: buildings or equipment will not be rented for extended use without approval of the Board of Education. No rental fee shall be charged for one of the baseball field by student summer leagues, however the cost of lighting must be paid when lights are used.

Rental Fee Schedule

Facility	Individuals or Firms	Community Groups
Baseball Field (Day)	$10.00	$5.00
Baseball Field (Night)	20.00	10.00
Gymnasium	25.00	12.50
Cafeteria	20.00	10.00
Kitchen	20.00	10.00
Classrooms	10.00	5.00

Equipment

Folding tables	2.00	1.00
Folding chairs (100)	10.00	5.00
Projectors	5.00	2.50
Projection Screens	2.00	1.00
Record Player	2.00	1.00
Tape Player	2.00	1.00
Typewriter	5.00	2.50

1003.6 Rental Regulations

The following regulations shall govern the rental and use of school property:

1. A written contract must be completed and signed by an adult for rental of any facilities or equipment.
2. Fees must be paid in advance of the rental date unless arrangements to charge are approved by the superintendent.
3. Renters shall comply with directions of the superintendent, or designated representatives of the superintendent, in the use of school property.
4. Renters must have one or more adults present at any time school property is used.
5. Renters must agree to reimburse the school for any loss or damage that occur to school property because of activities of the renter.
6. No property is to be removed from school premises unless permitted by the rental agreement.
7. Renters must agree to enforce state statutes and school district regulations that prohibit possession of, sale, or consumption of alcohol or drugs on school property.
8. Renters must agree that the school district shall not be held liable for any loss of property, damage to property, or personal injuries that occur in the use of school property.

FEE STRUCTURE SCHOOL DISTRICT #4

Custodial fees will be billed at an hourly rate of $20.00.

Security services where needed or requested will be billed at an hourly rate of $20.00

Cafeteria fees are based on an actual hourly rate plus 30% for school related organizations. Fees charged to outside organizations will be billed at an hourly rate of $19.00.

	Rental per two hour block per week	Rental per two hour block for the semester
Large high school gymnasium	$25.00	$250.00
Junior high school full gym	20.00	200.00
Junior high school half gym	15.00	150.00
Elementary gymnasium	10.00	100.00
Multi-purpose room	6.00	60.00
Junior high small gym	10.00	100.00
High school small gym	15.00	150.00
High school cafeteria	25.00	250.00

*Auditorium -- one rehearsal and one performance

In-District -- non profit	350.00
In-District -- profit making	750.00
Outside District	1500.00
Sound and Light Operator	12.50 per hour

Swimming Pool Minimum Charge for 30 people	50.00/hour
for each additional 30 people	5.00/hour
maximum, 120 people	65.00/hour
Pool Supervisor	12.50/hour
Lifeguard	5.00/hour

*Auditorium rental does not include needed personnel. Billing will be made for labor charges. All rental fees are payable in advance.

FEE STRUCTURE SCHOOL DISTRICT #5

Community Use of School Facilities

Rental Fees

Class A:

1. Designated school-affiliated organizations such as Booster Club, Band Parents, and Parent Teacher organizations.
2. Governmental units or committees.

3. City youth groups such as scouts or 4-H.
4. Educational agencies or institutions (local, state, federal).
5. Service organizations ... formally organized groups which are non-profit and exist primarily to serve the community. such groups shall include but not be limited to Adult Service groups such as Lions Club, Kiwanis, Rotary, Optimist, and the Chamber of Commerce.
6. Churches located within the school district.
7. Local chapters of charitable organizations formally organized and universally recognized which are non-profit and exist to provide benefits for residents of the school district.

Utilities
Classroom.....no charge
Gym.....no charge
Multi-purpose room.....no charge
(must pay for food service supervision if equipment is used).

Custodian
Fifteen dollars ($15.00) per hour for preparation time, opening and closing, clean-up time and attendance during use. Charges made only if custodial overtime is required.

Class B:
1. Business concerns located within and paying property taxes to the school district.
2. Private individuals, private or social groups located within and paying property taxes to the school district.

Utilities
Classroom.....$2.00 per hour
Multi-purpose room.....$5.00 per hour
Gym.....$8.00 per hour
Kitchen.....$2.00 per hour, plus hourly rate of food service personnel if equipment is used.

Custodian
Fifteen dollars ($15.00) per hour for preparation time, opening and closing, clean-up time and attendance

during use. Charges made only if custodial overtime is required.

Class C:
Private individuals, private or social groups, and groups or organizations based outside the school district shall not be granted rights without special approval by the Board of Education at which time the rental fee will be set.

FEE STRUCTURE SCHOOL DISTRICT #6
Facility Usage Fees

Fees are based on a two-hour minimum use stated unless otherwise and do not include custodial or supervisor services unless so stated. Building fees are to be paid ten days in advance. Custodial, equipment and operator, and supervision charges will be billed after the event. The building principal will collect fees and forward to the Director of Buildings and Grounds for deposit. Meals served in total by the cafeteria personnel will include all charges in the per meal charge. Concession sales or admission fees to facilities by non-school groups must have express written permission by the superintendent or authorized school district employee.

Fee for Buildings

Classrooms**	$ 4.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Elementary Cafeteria	25.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Middle School Cafeteria	30.00	per hour	2 hour min.
High School Cafeteria	35.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Elementary Kitchen****	25.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Middle School Kitchen****	30.00	per hour	2 hour min.
High School Kitchen****	35.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Library	6.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Elem. Gym/M.P.Room	18.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Middle Sch, Gym/Aux Gym	25.00	per hour	2 hour min.
High School Gym	30.00	per hour	2 hour min.
Locker Room - each	25.00	per event	
High Sch. Aud.****	150.00	per 3 hour block	
	50.00	per additional hour	
Auditorium****	175.00	per 3 hour block	
	58.00	per additional hour	
Memorial Stadium***	150.00	per 3 hour block	
	50.00	per additional hour	

Conference Center 100.00 per two hour block

**Custodial service included.
***No field use permitted.
****Must have appropriate operators on duty.

Equipment and Operator Use Charges

Movie Projector	$15.00 per hour*
TV/VCR	15.00 per hour*
Scoreboard	15.00 per hour*
Time Clock	15.00 per hour*
Stage Lights	35.00 per hour*
Stage Light Preparation Time	35.00 per hour*
Auditorium Sound System	35.00 per hour*
Gymnasium Sound System	35.00 per hour*
Conference Center Equipment	35.00 per hour*

*Fee includes equipment and required operator.

Charges for Personnel and Pay Rates

	Amount Charged*	Amount Paid to Employees
Certificated Super.	$12.00/hr.	$10.00/hr.
Custodial	11.93/hr. reg.	10.19/hr. reg.
Custodial O.T. Rate	17.63/hr. o.t.	15.29/hr. o.t.
Cafeteria Worker	7.50/hr. reg.	6.63/hr. reg.
	12.50/hr. o.t.	11.25/hr. o.t.
Cafeteria Manager	12.50/hr. reg.	11.05/hr. reg.
	17.50/hr. o.t.	15.46/hr. o.t.

*Charges include benefit cost incurred by the school district.

Special Use Permits

Little League Girls' Basketball, Little Leagues Boys' Basketball, YMCA, YWCA, and Midwest Missouri Youth Sports Association will be accorded rates as follows: Elementary/Middle School Gym - During the week, the rate will be $24.00 per hour (includes building and supervisor). Should there be a need for additional staff to clean or supervise, those costs will be charged to the group based on the personnel charges. The Saturday rate shall be $30.00 per hour (includes building, supervisor, and custodial.

All Other Groups
Upon application and approval of ten or more uses per request, a two dollar per hour discount will be awarded.

APPENDIX E

POPULATION OF STUDY

Adrian R-III
Advance R-IV
Arcardia Valley R-II
Ash Grove R-IV
Bernie R-XIII

Bismarck R-V
Bloomfield R-XIV
Boone County R-I
Booneville R-I
Bosworth R-V

Bourbon R-I
Breckenridge R-I
Brentwood Public Schools
Bunker R-III
Butler R-V

Cainsville R-I
Camden County R-II
Cameron R-I
Cape Girardeau 63 Schools
Cassville R-IV

Center 58
Centralia R-IV
Chilhowee R-VI
Clarkton C-4
Clearwater R-I

Climax Springs R-IV
Clinton Public Schools
Cole County R-V
Columbia Public Schools
Concordia R-II

Cooper County C-4
Cotter R-IV
Cowgill R-III
Craig R-III
Dexter R-XI

Dixon R-I
Doniphan R-I
Dora R-III
El Dorado Springs R-II

Eminence R-I
Exeter R-VI
Fair Grove R-X
Fairplay R-II
Fairview R-XI

Farmington R-VII
Ferguson-Florissant R-II
Festus R-VI
Fort Osage R-I
Fort Zumwalt Schools

Fulton 58
Galena R-II
Gideon Public Schools
Gilman City R-IV
Grandview R-II

Greenridge R-VIII
Green County R-VIII
Greenville R-II
Grundy County R-II
Hamilton R-II

Hancock Place
Hannibal Public Schools
Harrisonville R-IX
Hartville R-II
Hazelwood Public Schools

Hermitage R-IV
Hillsboro R-III
Holden R-III
Howell Valley R-I
Humansville R-IV

Jackson R-II
Jasper R-V
Jefferson City Schools
Jennings Public Schools
Joplin R-VIII

King City R-I
Kingsville R-I
Kirkwood County R-VIII
Knox County R-I

Ladue county C-I
Lafayette County C-I
Lafayette County R-X
Lakeland R-III
Laquey R-V

Lebanon R-III
Lincoln R-II
Lindberg Public Schools
Macks Creek R-V
Macon County R-I

Macon County R-IV
Malden R-I
Maries County R-I
Marionville R-IX
Marquad R-VI

Marshall Public Schools
Marshfield R-I
Mexico H59 R-I
Mid Buchanan R-V
Midway R-I
Miller County R-III

Moniteau County C-I
Naylor R-II
New Haven R-II
Newton Harris R-III
Norborne R-VIII

Normandy Public Schools
North Andrew R-VI
North Callaway R-I
North St. Francis Co.
North Harrison R-III

North Kansas City Schools
Northeast R-IV
Oran R-III
Oregan Howell R-III
Orrick R-XI

Osborne Public Schools
Otterville R-IV
Pemiscot County C-7

Pierce City R-VI
Plato R-V
Pleasant Hill R-III
Polo R-VII
Potosi R-III

Purdy R-II
Puxico R-VIII
Ridgeway R-V
Ripley County R-IV
Risco R-II

Ritenour School District
Rolla Public Schools
Scott County R-V
Sedalia Public Schools
Shelby County R-IV

Sheldon R-VIII
Smithville R-II
South Callaway R-II
South Harrison R-II
South Nodaway R-IV
Southland C-9

Spokane R-VIII
Springfield R-XIX
St. Charles R-V
St. Elizabeth R-IV
St. James R-I

Ste. Genevieve R-II
Summersville R-II
Tarkio R-I
Thayer R-II
Tri-County R-VII

University City Schools
Vandalia R-I
Verona R-VII
Walker R-IV
Warsaw R-IX

Washington Schools
Waynesville R-VI
Webster Grove Schools

Wellington-Napoleon R-IX
Wentzville R-IV
West St. Francis R-IV
West Nodaway R-I
Winona R-III

VITA

On July 20, 1946, in Mexico, Missouri, Robert G. Kirby was the eighth child of fourteen children born to Mr. and Mrs. Glen Kirby. Mr. Kirby attended elementary school in rural Howard County, Missouri, from 1952 until 1960. During 1960-1964 he attended high school in Fayette, Missouri. Upon graduation from high school, he entered Central Missouri State College.

During the summer of 1966, Mr. Kirby was drafted into the U.S. Army and served two years as an instructor. After separation from the army, Mr. Kirby married the former Marilyn Louise Woolley in December of 1968. Mr. and Mrs. Kirby have two children Shelly Louise and Shannon Grace.

Mr. Kirby returned to Central Missouri State College and attained a Bachelor of Science Degree in Education 1972, a Master Degree of Education in 1973, and an Educational Specialist Degree in 1975. A Doctorate in Educational Administration from the University of Missouri-Columbia was earned in 1993.

Mr. Kirby taught Industrial Arts at Concordia High School from 1972-1975, was Superintendent of Schools at Higbee, Missouri from 1975-1979, Pleasant Hope,

Missouri from 1979-1986, and has been employed by the Raytown Consolidated District #2, Raytown, Missouri, as Director of Building and Grounds from 1986 to the present.